

Il. ecc2. 541 $\frac{3}{1}$

REMARKS
ON
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM STELL, M.A.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS AGNES, IN CHURCH-LANE.

1801.

H. ecc. m $\frac{5}{1}$

REMARKS
ON
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

BY JOHN JORTIN, D.D.

LATE ARCHDEACON OF LONDON, ETC. ETC.

EDITED,

WITH COPIOUS NOTES, AND AN ACCOUNT OF THE LIFE AND
WRITINGS OF THE AUTHOR,

BY THE REV. WILLIAM TROLLOPE, M.A.

Διὰ δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας.—2 Cor. vi. 8.

Historia quoquo modo scripta delectat.—PLIN. JUN.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR THOMAS TEGG, 73, CHEAPSIDE.

MDCCCXLVI.

REMARKS

ON

ECCLIASTICAL HISTORY.

BIBLIOTHECA
REGIA
MONACENSIS.

LONDON:

BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

BY THE REV. WILLIAM TROLOPE, M.A.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THOMAS TRUGG, 73, CHURCHSIDE.

MDCCLXXXV.

TO CHARLES CASTLEMAN, ESQ.

MY DEAR SIR,

During my residence at Ringwood, nothing has contributed more essentially to my happiness than the attentive kindness, the social intercourse, and, I may add, the disinterested services, with which you have uniformly favoured me. Permit me, then, to offer a trifling acknowledgment of them; and at the same time to express the deep regret, which I am not alone in feeling, at the prospect of your probable removal from a neighbourhood which has been in various ways benefitted by your influence and example. This I cannot do more suitably than by connecting the avowal of my esteem and gratitude with the close of a laborious undertaking, of which your acknowledged talents and attainments, as well as your devoted attachment to our reformed faith, will lead you to appreciate the object, though perhaps, at the same time, to discover its defects.

I am,

MY DEAR SIR,

Your obliged and faithful Servant,

W. TROLLOPE.

POULNER COTTAGE,

December 9th, 1845.

PREFACE.

As “a necessary spremonition to the reader, who else might seek what he would not find,” DR. JORTIN prefaced the original edition of the work, which is now offered to the public in a more compact form, by stating that it was not to be considered as “a regular treatise, but only a collection of detached *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History* and *Ancient writers*, in which the order of time is neither strictly observed nor greatly neglected, and no anxious accuracy is bestowed upon the dates of years.” Now the want of a strict methodical arrangement, and some important gaps which required to be filled up, were perhaps the only hindrance to the far more general use of a production of greater merit, whether in point of amusement or instruction, than many of larger extent and higher pretension. These defects, therefore, it is the object of the present edition to supply.

By arranging the subjects and events in chronological order, by removing into the notes much illustrative matter borrowed from other writers, by introducing several long *appendices* into their proper places in the body of the work, by inserting such additional information and remark as the less superficial reader must otherwise seek from other sources, and yet without taking even the most trifling liberty with the text of his author, the Editor has endeavoured to place in the hands of the student in Ecclesiastical history a collection of facts, with thoughts and observations upon them, which, at the present crisis more

especially, cannot fail to be serviceable. An Index, which will be a useful companion to the Analytical Table of Contents, has also been added. It should be stated moreover, that, in order to compress the volumes within reasonable limits, the Latin translations of passages cited from Greek authors have been omitted throughout. To the scholar, such aids are superfluous; and others, if indeed the versions be not as difficult as the original, will find them in the editions from which they were taken. It would have been more to the point to have substituted an English translation; but in a large majority of instances the text, which they illustrate, is a sufficient guide to their meaning. Some passing observations on the character of the work will be found in the annexed sketch of the Life of the Author.

Of the original Preface, attached to the first volume of the *Remarks*, the chief portion has found a more appropriate position at their close. Another brief extract runs thus:—"The author would willingly escape the dislike of some of those persons, with whom perhaps he will be found not entirely to agree. He and they are engaged in the same common cause, and he hopes that, for the sake of many remarks contained in his work, they will excuse the rest; as, on his part, a diversity of sentiments in some points lessens not the regard and value which he has for them, and which they so justly deserve." With a plea for the like indulgence, of which the Author has no longer need, the Editor commends his more humble labours to the favour of those, for whose benefit they were undertaken.

W. T.

ANALYSIS

OF THE

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

FROM THE FIRST PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL TO THE DEATH OF
CONSTANTINE.

(A.D. 30 TO A.D. 337.)

	PAGE
I.—Circumstances of the Roman Empire favourable to the beginning and increase of Christianity	1
Proposal of Tiberius to deify Christ—Its improbability	2
Origin of the tradition	2
Motives by which Pilate may have been actuated with regard to Christ	2
<i>The "ACTS OF PILATE," a forgery</i>	2
<i>Intolerance of Paganism</i>	4
Growing contempt of the higher orders for the popular religion . . .	5
The 'Αποκολόκυντωσις of Seneca	5
Extent of Nero's persecution	6
Judaism and Christianity tolerated by Claudius	6
Conjecture on a passage in Juvenal	7
<i>Terms of reproach applied to Christians</i>	7
<i>Christ and Christians regarded as magicians</i>	7
II.—Case of the Dæmoniacs who are mentioned in the New Testament . .	9
III.—The gift of tongues	10
<i>Object and extent of the miracle</i>	11
<i>Apollonius of Tyana</i>	11
IV.—The predictions of Christ concerning the destruction of Jerusalem enumerated and shown to have been accomplished, and to have been extant before the event	13
Josephus and his writings	18
His evidence in favour of Christianity	19
Dreadful depravity of the Jews in the time of Christ	20
Books of the New Testament authentic, and proved to be so by internal characters	22
<i>John Hardouin and his opinions</i>	22

	PAGE
Few of the early disciples survived the destruction of Jerusalem . . .	24
The books of the New Testament cited or alluded to by Apostolical Fathers . . .	26
Shorter Epistles of Ignatius preferred to the larger	30
<i>Question of their genuineness</i>	33
New Testament cited by ancient heretics	34
Collateral evidence that the predictions of Christ could not have been inserted after the event	36
Conjecture on a passage in Josephus	39
Eusebius and Herodotus explained	42
 V.—Remarks on Prophecy in general, and on its uses	43
<i>The Dæmon of Socrates, &c.</i>	45
Prophecies of double fate	46
Pagan notions of a double destiny	47
Consolatory predictions	48
Superstitions of Atheists	50
Divination in the Pagan world considered	51
Limits of dæmoniac power	53
Prophecy more convincing than miracles	53
The history of Tobit	54
Source of the prophetic spirit	55
Cicero's work on Divination	55
A prophetic dream of Socrates	56
<i>Modern accounts of prophecies and prophetic dreams</i>	56
<i>Remarkable dream of Jacobus Guionius</i>	57
<i>Visions of Rice Evans</i>	58
Pagan oracles	57
Case of the damsel in Acts xvi. 16	62
Idolatry whether worse than Atheism, and Bayle's sentiments considered	64
Eusebius, his account of oracles	70
Oracles ridiculed by Aristophanes and Lucian	71
Oracles at Hierapolis mentioned by Lucian <i>de Dea Syria</i> , and some remarks on that book	72
The opinions of Herodotus and of Van Dale concerning oracles	76
<i>Remarks on an oracle of Bacis given by Herodotus</i>	77
 VI.—Prophecies relating to Christ and Christianity in particular	80
<i>Causes of obscurity in Prophecy</i>	80
Proof that Jesus was the promised Messiah	81
Prophecies in the Old Testament which cannot be supposed to have been forged after the event	83
Prophecy considered under four heads	86
1. Accommodations	86
2. Direct prophecies	86
3. Types	87
<i>Points of resemblance between Joseph and Christ, and Samson and Christ</i>	87
4. Prophecies of double sense	88
Prophets not always aware of the import of their predictions	89

	PAGE
Omens also of dubious import	90
Remarks on Horace's Ode, <i>O Navis</i> , &c.	91
The prediction of Moses of a Prophet like himself, examined	92
<i>Treatise of Ammonius on the resemblance between Moses and Christ</i>	94
<i>Account of Ammonius and his writings</i>	95
Points of resemblance between Moses and Christ, partly from Eusebius	95
<i>Conjecture on a passage in Herodotus</i>	99
<i>Reason of the prohibition of eating blood</i>	100
Typical import of the <i>Brazen Serpent</i>	101
Punishment of the Jews for rejecting Christ	103
Resemblance between <i>Bacchus</i> and <i>Moses</i>	103
<i>Story respecting Hercules borrowed from Moses</i>	104
Connection between Judaism and Christianity	104
<i>Nature of Typical evidence</i>	105
 VII.—Remarks upon miracles in general	 105
Notions of Van Dale and Le Clerc concerning them	106
The opinion that God alone can work miracles, not probable	106
The miracles of our Saviour and of his Apostles defended	107
Testimony of Quadratus, concerning the miracles of Christ	108
<i>A passage in Tertullian corrected</i>	109
The miracles of Christ were of a prophetic nature, and represented future events	 111
Reasons for which our Saviour cast out evil spirits	112
Difference between the writers of the New Testament and the writers of Legends	 116
One of St. Paul's miracles of the prophetic kind	116
St. Paul, an emblem perhaps of the Jewish nation	117
An answer to an objection from the miracles of false Christs	117
The Apostles seem to have wrought miracles only when they were moved by the Holy Spirit	 119
Recapitulation of the arguments in behalf of Christianity	120
<i>Faith must be founded on evidence</i>	120
Dangers of Deism	121
General remarks on the miracles said to have been wrought after the Apostolical days, in the second and third centuries	 122
These miracles not to be compared, in point of evidence, with the miracles of Christ and the Apostles	 122
The arguments which may be alleged in favour of them	123
Objections which may be made to them	124
The evidence in their favour somewhat preponderates	125
Some of them not improbable	126
Constancy of the Martyrs can only be ascribed to Divine assistance	126
<i>The doctrine of a particular Providence maintained by Wollaston and Le Clerc</i>	 126
The miracles after Constantine deserve no credit	127
Notions of Van Dale, Moyle, and Le Clerc, respecting the miracles after the days of the Apostles	 129

	PAGE
<i>Van Dale's opinion on Dæmoniacal possession</i>	129
Middleton also rejected the post-Apostolic miracles	130
Le Clerc's character of Van Dale and Moyle	132
The Christian miracles of different ages, how far credible or not	132
The improbable story of Abgarus	133
The conversion of the inhabitants of Edessa	134
The Æthiopians instructed by the Eunuch	134
Miracles wrought by Apostolical men	134
Justin Martyr of opinion that miraculous gifts had been continued down to his time	136
VIII.—Of the story of <i>St. John's Martyrdom</i>	136
The story doubtful	136
Whence it might arise	137
Oil not used in baptism till after the days of Justin	137
<i>Baptism of a prince represented on an ancient bas-relief</i>	137
Tertullian very credulous	137
IX.—The Apostolical Constitutions considered	137
<i>Their contents, and the probable date and motive of the forgery</i>	138
In what their value consists	138
Their account of the <i>Charismata</i>	139
How they speak of the Apostles	139
And of episcopal authority	139
Remarks on a supposed compiler of them	140
Their absurd misapplications of Scripture	141
Remarks on the Song of Solomon	141
The Constitutions twice refer to it	142
What they say of dæmoniacs	143
Of baptism	144
Of adultery	145
They contain some excellent prayers	146
The Hellenistic language	146
Internal evidence of spuriousness in the Constitutions	147
Their account of the combat of Simon Magus with St. Peter	148
Their notions of the Jewish sects	150
Tenets of the <i>Sadducees</i>	150
Their alleged rejection of the Prophets examined	151
Doctrines and character of the <i>Pharisees</i>	157
Why more severely censured by Christ than the <i>Sadducees</i>	158
Account of the Essenes	159
A passage in Porphyry concerning the Essenes explained	160
And in Josephus	161
Story of the Phoenix	162
A forged Sibylline oracle cited in the Constitutions	163
An emendation of a fault in it	163
X.—The Apostolical Canons considered	164
Beveridge's defence of them untenable	165
<i>Remarks on the authority of the early Father</i>	166

	PAGE
XI.—The Sibylline oracles examined, and rejected as forgeries and impostures .	167
Homer's Prophecy concerning Æneas and his posterity	169
Fabricius, his account of the Sibylline Oracles	170
Virgil's fourth Eclogue considered	172
Orphic verses, and fragments of Greek poets, &c., which are cited by the Fathers, examined and corrected	175
<i>Spurious verses ascribed to Sophocles</i>	179
Eusebius not to be charged with defending the Sibylline Oracles	181
Justin Martyr not the forger of them	183
Sibylline Oracles which were made by Pagans	185
XII.—The Apostolical Fathers	186
1. The antiquity and dubious authority of the Epistle ascribed to Barnabas	186
<i>Some account of him</i>	187
Remarks on the Epistle	189
2. Hermas and his book entitled the <i>Shepherd</i>	190
Its date and character	191
3. <i>Account of Clemens Romanus</i>	191
<i>Date of his Episcopate</i>	192
<i>Remarks on his Epistle to the Corinthians</i>	193
<i>His Second Epistle not genuine</i>	193
Examination of a passage in the former	193
The <i>Recognitions</i> of Clemens, a wretched romance	194
A passage in them explained	194
4. <i>Some account of Ignatius</i>	195
Remarks on his Epistles	196
A reading in one of them defended	197
<i>Remarks on a tax instituted by Augustus</i>	200
Remarks on the martyrdom of Ignatius	201
5. <i>History of Polycarp</i>	205
Remarks on his martyrdom, &c.	206
The Epistle of the Church of Smyrna genuine, though possibly interpolated	207
Polycarp's vision	208
The voice from heaven	210
The sweet smell which came from the pile	210
Many miracles of this trifling kind	211
The arching of the flames	211
Miracles ascribed to monks of the fourth century	211
<i>The Hirpi walked barefoot over fire</i>	213
<i>Trials by fire and water</i>	213
The story of the dove, &c.	214
Stories of the same kind	215
Conjectures concerning the word <i>περιστέρα</i>	215
Le Clerc's opinion concerning the dove	215
Eusebius mentions it not	216
He omits also a story of the same kind in Josephus	216
Polycarp's prayer at the stake	217
A mistake of Valesius	217

	PAGE
Polycarp's reply to the Proconsul not blameable	217
The city of Smyrna ruined by an earthquake	217
Polycarp's age	217
Date of his martyrdom	218
<i>Illustration of a passage in the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna</i>	218
His martyrdom well attested	219
The constancy of the Martyrs to be ascribed to divine assistance	219
The constancy of persons who were, or were called, heretics	221
Mark of Arethusa, his sufferings, and the remarks of Tillemont upon them	222
Martyrologies usually romantic	223
Acts of Perpetua ancient, but perhaps adulterated	223
The increase of Christianity in times of persecution	225
The alteration for the better which Christianity produced in those who received it	226
Its success can only be ascribed to the Spirit of God	227
6. Remarks on the <i>Epistle to Diognetus</i>	227
The Epistle, though not written by Justin Martyr, the work of <i>no inconsiderable writer</i>	229
Observations on the sentiments and writings of Tillemont	230
Justin Martyr and Clemens Alexandrinus had favourable opinions of the future condition of virtuous Pagans	231
Clemens Alexandrinus explained and corrected	231
7. Papias, his character and opinions	232
Whether an Ebionite	233
8. The Epistle of Tiberianus to Trajan, a forgery	233
XIII.—Remarks on the Apologists and their writings	234
Quadratus and Aristides	234
<i>Athenagoras</i>	235
<i>His Legation</i>	236
The Apologies seen in all probability by some emperors, and serviceable to the Christian cause	236
Christians not forbidden to read certain books	237
The character of Adrian	237
The account which he gives of the Egyptians	237
His rescript to Minucius	237
He was no enemy to the Christians	237
Severus Alexander a friend to the Christians	238
No images in Christian Churches till after Constantine	238
Character and style of the apologetic writings	239
XIV.—The miserable state of the Jews under Adrian	240
Aquila, <i>his apostacy, and translation of the Scriptures</i>	240
The account given of him by Epiphanius	240
Fabulous miracles related by Epiphanius	241
His credulity	241
Orosius relates a false miracle	241
A wonder recorded by Josephus which happened before the destruction of Jerusalem	242

Plutarch's silence concerning Christianity	242
Quintilian censures the Jews	242
XV.—Justin Martyr, his character and writings	243
<i>Story of his conversion</i>	244
<i>His dialogue with Trypho</i>	245
His account of the statue of Simon seems to be a mistake	245
Obscure and worthless men deified by the Pagans even in his time	246
Authority of the Fathers. It is better to defer too little than too much to it	247
Justin's Dialogue genuine	249
Character of Hegesippus as an historian	249
Tatian, his writings and opinions	250
Errors of the Encratites	250
Alcibiades, the martyr, reproved for an erroneous notion	250
XVI.—The story of the Thundering Legion improbable	251
Forged rescripts in favour of Christianity	251
Marcus Aurelius, no friend to the Christians	252
The martyrdom of Apollonius	252
Roman senate not favourable to Christianity	253
Remarks on Lucian, Apuleius, Porphyry, and the Platonic philosophers	254
Lucian not an apostate	254
Augustine, his doubts concerning the transformation of Apuleius	254
Mysteries of heretics and philosophers	255
Vigilantius ill-used by Jerome	256
Porphyry's concessions in favour of Christianity	256
His writings suppressed	256
Attempt of Plotinus to establish Plato's Republic	256
Beneficial effect of Christianity illustrated	257
Bardesanes, his character and sentiments	257
<i>His Treatise de Fato</i>	257
Melito, whether a prophet	259
<i>Account of him and his writings</i>	259
State of the Christians in the reign of Commodus	260
XVII.—The Montanists	260
Tertullian	261
Proculus is said to have cured Severus with oil	261
Facts relating to that story	262
Behaviour of Severus towards the Christians	263
Rutilius the martyr, his prudence and piety	264
XVIII.— <i>Account of Theophilus, and his writings</i>	265
Remarks on his Treatise to Autolycus	265
It is probable that there were no resurrections in his days	267
No examples of resurrections mentioned by Clemens Romanus, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Tatian, Minucius Felix, &c.	267
Pagan accounts of resurrections	268
A passage in Theophilus explained	268

	PAGE
XIX.—Irenæus, and his writings	269
<i>Epistle from the Gallic churches about the Martyrs of Lyons and Vienne</i>	269
Remarks on his account of miracles	270
<i>His alleged credulity</i>	270
<i>His work against heretics</i>	270
No resurrections in his time to be collected from his testimony	271
His statement compared with that of Quadratus	271
He does not state that all Christians could work miracles	272
<i>Various emendations of the old Latin version of Irenæus</i>	272
His real views on the subject of miracles	273
Ejection of dæmons, and the gift of tongues	274
Dæmoniacs of the New Testament	275
<i>The Gadarene dæmoniac</i>	275
Tertullian's dæmoniac	275
The creed of Irenæus	276
Le Clerc's remarks upon it	276
Tertullian's creed	277
<i>The Apostles' creed</i>	277
XX.—Pantænus, a preacher of the Gospel in India	278
<i>Some account of him, and the early Indian missions</i>	278
<i>Remarks on Clement of Alexandria, with explanations of several passages</i> <i>quoted by him from the Greek poets and other writers</i>	279
Narcissus, and the miracles related concerning him	279
<i>His great age and consequent retirement</i>	284
Fountains of oil	285
Natalis, and the miraculous punishment inflicted upon him for going over to heretics	285
Jerome whipped by angels	285
The poverty of Lactantius	286
His writings	286
The state of the Christians in the third century	286
Of the Christian soldiers	286
Paul the hermit, and his life by Jerome	288
The Novatians	288
XXI.—Origen, his character and sentiments	288
His letter to his father	289
His work against Celsus	290
His testimony concerning miracles and visions	290
His notions of <i>spells</i> and <i>dæmons</i>	291
<i>Synesius</i>	291
The story of <i>Basilides</i> and <i>Potamiæna</i>	292
The Platonic Trinity	293
XXII.—Gregory Thaumaturgus	293
His miracles ill attested	294
Said to have received a creed from the hands of St. John	294
Stories of the like kind	294

	PAGE
XXIII.—A view of the Manichæan heresy	295
Account of <i>Manichæus</i> or <i>Manes</i>	301
Ancient heresies from which his system was borrowed	302
Augustine's controversy with Faustus the Manichæan	303
The Waldenses and Albigenses accused of Manichæism	304
Ancient heretics misrepresented	304
Miracles pretended to have been wrought by the monks	305
Eastern Christians great fasters	305
Propagation of heresies no objection to the argument drawn from the propagation of Christianity	306
Strange notions of some old heretics	306
Eunomians not Manichæans, but misrepresented by some of the Fathers	307
Athanasius rejected Arian baptism	309
A remark of Lord Shaftsbury	309
The Persian god Mithras	309
Zoroastrian Oracles impostures	309
Manichæism conformable in some points to the Stoical doctrine	309
The destruction of <i>Arimanius</i> and <i>Hades</i>	310
Wine held in abomination by the Manichæans, and by others before them	310
Weakness and inconsistency of the Manichæan hypothesis	311
Milton makes Satan talk like a Manichæan	311
Bayle confuted by Le Clerc	312
XXIV.—1. Cyprian, his character and sentiments	312
Improbable miracles related by Cyprian, Macarius, and Sozomen	314
<i>A wonderful stone mentioned and described in Thuanus</i>	315
2. Dionysius of Alexandria, instance of a particular providence re- lated by	316
His character	317
The visions and revelations which he had	318
3. Felix of Nola, and the false reports concerning his miracles	318
4. Piety and charity of the Christians in the third century, and in times of distress	318
Goths converted to Christianity	318
5. Paul of Samosata deposed for heresies and immoralities	319
6. Conversion of Arnobius	319
Character of his writings	319
A passage in him corrected	320
7. Antony the monk, and his romantic life by Athanasius	320
<i>Remarks of Melchior Canus and Ludovicus Vives, on the lives of the saints</i>	322
<i>Character of modern monks</i>	323
8. Hypsistarii, or Coëlicolæ, a sect of Deists	323
9. Diocletian's persecution, and the constancy of the martyrs	324
Depravation of manners amongst the Christians	324
Extraordinary events and miracles, which are said to have attended the sufferings of the martyrs	325
Martyrdom of Romanus, and the false miracles relating to it	326
Eusebius not the forger of them	326
Rufinus and Jerome unfaithful translators	327

	PAGE
Martyrdom of a Marcionite	327
10. Conversion of two Pantomimes	327
11. The romance of the Theban legion	328
12. A divine judgment on the patriarch of Seleucia	328
Milles, a Persian bishop and martyr	329
XXV.—State of the Church after CONSTANTINE	330
Remarks on the cross, &c., which was seen by Constantine, and which seems to have been a solar halo	331
Licinius pretended to have been instructed and assisted by an angel .	333
Whether he was a Christian	333
XXVI.—The causes, origin, and progress, of the worship of saints, martyrs, and relics, of monkery, &c.	333
The Fathers were the encouragers of these superstitions	334
Christian saints supplied the place and the offices of Pagan deities .	335
Eusebius not entirely excusable in this point	335
The Consubstantialists ran more into these excesses than the Arians .	335
Monkish ignorance, austerities, and fanaticism	337
Whence the Devil came to be painted black	338
Monks, imitators of Pagan philosophers	340
Chelsea College, and what it was designed for by James I.	340
The monks were not all of them saints	341
Account of them by Athanasius	341
Eusebius, Constantine, and Jerome, admirers of virginity and celibacy .	341
Monks may have been sometimes misrepresented and wronged	342
Miracles, for what purposes they were wrought in those times . . .	342
Monkish miracles preserved by tradition	343
Character of the Egyptians and of their monks	343
Valens an enemy to them	343
He made them serve public offices	343
How they came to be so numerous	344
Protected by the clergy, and disliked by others	344
Paula and Eustochium, pious pilgrims	344
Story of Melania	345
Ambrose, an admirer of virginity	345
XXVII.—The schism of the Donatists	346
XXVIII.—An account of the Arian controversy	347
Alexander excommunicates Arius and others	349
Sozomen and Theodoret give a good character to some Arian prelates .	349
Alexander uses weak arguments against the Arians	350
His notions very like those of the Semiarians	350
A supposed miracle in his favour	350
Notion of Jurieu that the articles of Christian faith were not understood in the three first centuries	350
Philostorgius not favourable to Alexander	351
Constantine treats the Arian controversy as frivolous	351

	PAGE
<i>Valesius mistranslates the emperor's epistle</i>	351
Nicene council. Quarrels of the Fathers	352
General councils not infallible	352
Extent of their authority	354
Character of the councils of Constantinople and Ephesus	354
Eusebius against the <i>δμοούσιος</i>	356
Disputes about the meaning of the word	356
Eusebius, his sense of it	356
Council of Antioch, their strange interpretation of it	356
Le Clerc's account of general councils	357
Symeon Stylites, his notion of them	359
Summary account of the Arian controversy for forty years	360
An Arian creed	361
Divisions amongst the Arians	362
Apollinaris, his notion of the <i>Λόγος</i>	363
Pagans deride these controversies	363
Scoffing temper of the Alexandrians	363
Judgment of Erasmus concerning the dispute	364
Semiarians	365
Coeternity of the <i>Λόγος</i> considered	366
Dr. Clark's opinion	366
<i>Le Clerc's notion concerning the controversy</i>	367
Consubstantiality, how understood by the Nicene Fathers	369
Scholastic and cabbalistic notions concerning it	370
Disputes about the word <i>hypostasis</i>	371
State of Arianism after Constantine	372
The faults on both sides	372
Constantine variable in his conduct towards the contending parties	373
The creed of Arius	373
The death of Arius, and the various opinions about it	374
Supposed to have been obtained by the prayers of Alexander	375
Controversy concerning the Holy Ghost	375
The creed of the Semiarians	375
The Nicene creed, as it stood originally	376
XXIX.—I. Institution of Christian holy days	377
2. An unreasonable canon relating to marriage	377
3. Constantine assisted by pretended angels	377
Said to have had a divine revelation to build Constantinople	378
Appoints chaplains for the Army	378
State of literature in his reign	378
He builds many churches, palaces, &c.	378
His superstition	379
He was buried in a church	379
His clemency and character	379
<i>Remarks on the sincerity of his conversion</i>	379
His miracles after death	380
4. Deposition of <i>Eustathius</i> , bishop of Antioch	380
Character of the fourth century	380

	PAGE
5. Conversion of some Indian nations	380
Wonderful conversion of the Iberi	381
History of <i>Theophilus</i> , the Arian missionary to the Homeritæ, and of his miracles	383
6, 7. <i>Spyridon</i> and <i>Agapetus</i> , supposed to have been workers of miracles .	384
8. The story of the discovery of the cross	385
<i>Remarks on Dupin and his Bibliothéque</i>	385
<i>Paulinus a bad witness for miracles</i>	387
<i>Silence of Eusebius on the subject</i>	390
9. Prudence of Paphnutius with regard to the married clergy	391
10. Council of Illiberis. Its canons about usury, virginity, and against the Jews	392
XXX.—An account of the ecclesiastical historians, and of Valesius, their editor	
1. Eusebius, his character, and notions concerning the Arian contro- versy, the nature of the Son and Holy Spirit, miracles, images, &c.	393
Some passages in his works corrected or explained	395
<i>Remarks on the Præparatio and Demonstratio Evangelica, and on some authors who are cited in the former</i>	400
<i>Ancient oracles corrected and explained</i>	400
<i>Ezechiel Tragicus</i>	402
<i>Africanus</i>	402
<i>Plato supposed to have borrowed some things from Moses</i>	402
<i>Plotinus</i>	403
<i>Timon Phliasius</i>	403
Second council of Nice establishes the worship of images	408
<i>Character of Eusebius, as an historian</i>	409
2. Socrates, the historian	410
3. Sozomen	411
4. Theodoret	412
His account of monkish miracles	412
His disputes with Cyril	413
Cyril's character	413
Nestorian controversy	414
Character and opinions of Theodoret	414
5. Evagrius	416
6. Theodorus Byzantius	417
7. Philostorgius	417
XXXI.—Remarks on the laws of Constantine	
His laws against branding, crucifixion, &c.	419
Against gladiators	419
In favour of farmers	419
Against usury	420
In favour of prisoners, slaves, debtors, and the poor	420
Against rapes	420
Against divorces	420
In favour of the clergy. (<i>Repealed afterwards by Julian</i>)	420
In favour of the Church	421

	PAGE
In favour of bishops	421
In favour of matrimony	421
The condition of natural children	421
Laws against making eunuchs	422
For the relief of the sick	422
Miraculous cures in the temples of Æsculapius	422
Laws against delators	423
Against bad magistrates	423
Against adultery	423
In favour of celibacy	423
Against sacrificing	424
Against Egyptian superstitions and debaucheries, &c.	424
<i>Herodotus explained</i>	424
Laws against magic	425
For the observation of the Lord's day	425
A form of prayer for the soldiers	426
Laws against persecution	426
Against heretics	426
For building of churches	427
Against blasphemy	427
Against Paganism	427
For burning heretical books	428
Against Judaism	428
For consulting the Haruspices in certain cases	428
Pagan superstition of Constantine	428
His severity	428

XXXII.—The accomplishment of the prophecies in the destruction of persecuting princes and magistrates, &c.

	429
1. Herod the Great	429
2. Herod Antipas	430
Salome	430
3. Pontius Pilate	430
4. Caiaphas	431
5. Flaccus	431
6. Catullus	431
7. Caius	432
8. Herod Agrippa	432
Claudius Heminianus, &c.	432
Antiochus Epiphanes	432
Pheretimé	432
9. Ananias	433
10. Ananus	433
11. Nero	433
12. Domitian	433
Treatment of the Christians by <i>Trajan, Titus Antoninus, and</i> <i>M. Aurelius</i>	433
13. Severus	434
14. Saturninus	434

	PAGE
15. Heliogabalus	434
16. Decius	434
17. Gallus	434
18. Valerian	434
19. Æmilian	434
20. Aurelian	435
21. Maximinus I.	435
22. Diocletian	435
His change in the form of government	435
23. Severus	436
24. Urbanus	436
25. Firmilianus	436
26. Maximianus Herculus	437
27. Maximianus Galerius	437
28. Maxentius	437
29. Maximinus, Pincentius, Culcianus, Theotecnus, &c.	437
Charity of the Christians	438
30. A Roman officer, and	
31. Licinius	439
32. Julian and his associates	440
33. Count Julian, Felix, Elpidius	440
34. Hero, Theotecnus, Thalassius, and the Pagans of Heliopolis	444
35. Valens	446
36. Eugenius and	
37. Arbogastes	446
Miracles in favour of Theodosius	446
38. Radagaisus	447
False miracles	448
39. Hunneric	448
Modern persecutors	449
40. The Baron d'Oppede	449
41. John the monk	450
42. Lewis XI	450
Quick succession of the Roman emperors serviceable to Christianity	450
The 110th Psalm explained, and compared with the 2nd Psalm	451
Compared with other prophecies	453
The interpretation of Ruarus rejected	457
XXXIII.—The condition of the Jews from the destruction of Jerusalem to this day	458
Remarks on God's dealings with them	458
Of the Gipsies	461
T. Jackson's account of the Jews, not impartial	461
The false Messiahs who have appeared since the resurrection of Christ	462
Barcohab	462
Moses Cretensis	462
Dunaan	462
Julian	462
Mohammed	463

	PAGE
A Syrian Jew	463
A French Jew	463
A Persian Jew	463
A Spanish Jew	463
An African Jew	463
An Arabian Jew	463
A Jew who dwelt beyond Euphrates	464
A Persian Jew	464
David Almusser, &c.	464
David Alroi	464
Ismael Sophus	464
Rabbi Lemlem	464
Pfefferkorn	464
Rabbi Solomo Malcho	464
An Indian Jew	465
One in the Low Countries	465
Sabatai Sevi	465
Nehemiah Cohen	469
Rabbi Mordecai	471
State of the Jews under Titus	472
Domitian	472
Trajan	472
Adrian	473
Antoninus Pius	473
Marcus Aurelius	473
Severus	473
Constantine	474
<i>Cruel decree of a council of Toledo</i>	474
Jews confuted by pretended miracles	475
Constantine's decrees against them	476
Their rebellion under Constantius	479
<i>Laws made in their favour by Honorius, Theodosius II., and Valen-</i> <i>tinian I.</i>	479
Considerations on Julian's attempt to rebuild the temple	480
An account in Tacitus of fire issuing from the earth	481
<i>A remarkable fountain in Poland</i>	481
Subterraneous fires	482
The fires which have accompanied earthquakes	482
Earthquakes in Palestine	483
<i>Modern explanation of the cause of Julian's failure</i>	483
Examination of the reasons for receiving the miracle as real	484
Christian sepulchre opened by Herod	487
<i>Story of Barsanuph the monk</i>	487
God usually manifested his presence by fire	487
Sufferings of the Jews, and lies invented concerning them	488
Pretended miracles to expose the Jews	489
Ambrose defends the burning of a synagogue	489
A Jew wonderfully healed	491
Symeon Stylites defends the seizing upon the synagogues	492

	PAGE
Remarks on his miracles	492
The confessors who spake when their tongues were cut out	493
Lying miracles in the <i>Chronicon Saxonicum</i>	493
Agobard's complaints against the Jews	493
Popes favourable to them	494
Decrees of the council of Basle concerning them	494
Improbable account of the Jews assembling in the plain of Ageda .	496
Present state of the Jews	496
Conjectures concerning the calling of the Jews, and remarks on the difficulties which attend the conversion of that people, of the Mohammedans, and of the Pagans	497
Limborch's method of disputing with Orobios	504

A BRIEF ACCOUNT

OF THE

Life and Writings

OF

JOHN JORTIN, D. D.

Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀνὴρ τῆς ἀληθείας ὑπεραγωνιζόμενος.—EUSEB. H. E. iv. 7.

Vixit, scripsit, obiit!—Such might possibly be adopted as the brief, yet comprehensive and appropriate record of the career of a host of labourers in the Christian vineyard; and though not so brilliant an epitome of boasted success as the “*Veni, vidi, vici*,” of the Roman conqueror, it would at least be as faithful a memorial of services rendered in their generation. To devote the energies of a quiet and unobtrusive life to the duties of an arduous and responsible profession; to extend the benefits of pastoral care beyond the limits of an appointed charge by writings in the various branches of Ecclesiastical and Theological Literature; and “being dead, yet to speak” in an example of an unwavering faith, a lively hope, and a sterling charity:—this is a course which may not be calculated to furnish materials for an interesting and effective biography, but it will convey a lesson full of instruction to the understanding and the heart. It is not intended to class the subject of the present memoir with the brightest ornaments of our church; but there is yet ample proof that he did his portion of good in his day, and his writings are a legacy of no mean value to posterity.

Among the Protestants who quitted France in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, in the year 1685, was

Renatus Jortin, a young man of good family in Bretagne, who, with his father and friends, sought an asylum in England from the persecution which threatened them in their own country. He seems to have been possessed of considerable acquirements; and in 1691 he was appointed one of the gentlemen of the privy-chamber by William III. About this period he married Martha, daughter of the Rev. Daniel Rogers, of Haversham in Buckinghamshire; and his son JOHN was born in London, on the 23rd of October, 1698, in the parish of St. Giles in the Fields. In the mean time he held the office of Secretary, first to Admiral Sir Edward Russel, and afterwards to Sir George Rooke; and subsequently obtained the same appointment under Sir Cloudesley Shovel, with whom he perished on board the *Association*, which was wrecked off the coast of Scilly, on the 22nd of October, 1707.

At the time of this disastrous occurrence, his son was within one day of the completion of his ninth year. With a view to his education at the Charter-house, his widowed mother removed into that neighbourhood; and her sorrows were doubtless alleviated by watching the rapid progress which he made. Gifted with a remarkable facility in the acquisition of languages, at the age of fifteen he had not only completed the course of classical learning beyond which, in those days, a boy seldom advanced at school, but had devoted his leisure hours at home to learning French, which he read and spoke with accuracy and ease. As he was yet too young to enter at the University, he turned his attention to arithmetic and the elementary branches of the mathematics; and thus occupied the time which intervened between his leaving school and his admission, as a pensioner, at Jesus College, Cambridge, on the 16th May, 1715. At this period Dr. Styan Thirlby, the learned editor of Justin Martyr, was Classical Tutor of the College; and he was neither slow in observing and appreciating the superior attainments of his new pupil, nor remiss in encouraging his further progress and improvement. So extensive indeed, even at this early age, was his acquaintance with the language and literature of ancient Greece, that at the doctor's recommendation he was selected, while yet an undergraduate, to translate those passages from the Commentary of Eustathius, which Mr. Pope, who was then engaged upon his translation of Homer, has introduced into his notes.

With reference to some remarks on a passage, which he conceived that Pope had misunderstood, Jortin himself, many years afterwards, wrote as follows:—"When that part of Homer came out, in which I had been concerned, I was eager, as it may be supposed, to see how things stood, and much pleased to find that he had not only used almost all my notes, but had hardly made any alteration in the expressions. I observed also that, in a subsequent edition, he corrected the place to which I had made objections.—I was in some hopes in those days,—for I was young,—that Mr. Pope would make inquiry about his coadjutor, and take some civil notice of him: but he did not; and I had no notion of obtruding myself upon him. I never saw his face." It should seem that this was not the only instance in which Pope was alike deficient in courtesy and gratitude.

In January 1719, Mr. Jortin took his *Bachelor's* degree, and was admitted in due course to that of *Master of Arts* in 1722, having in the mean time been elected a fellow of his college. His severer studies having been now in some measure relaxed, he occupied his comparatively leisure hours with the elegancies of Latin literature; and in the latter year published a small volume of "*Lusus Poetici*," which have considerable merit, and have been more than once reprinted. The reader will find a pleasing specimen of his Latin effusions at p. 58 of the volume he is perusing. In 1723 he discharged the University office of *Taxor*. He now entered into holy orders, being ordained deacon by Dr. Kennet, bishop of Peterborough, on the 22nd of September, 1723; and raised to the priesthood by Dr. Green, bishop of Ely, on the 24th of June, 1724. In 1726 his College presented him to the vicarage of *Swavesey* in Cambridgeshire, which he held for a short period in conjunction with his fellowship, until he vacated the latter, in 1727, by his marriage with Anne, daughter of Mr. Chibnall, of Newport Pagnell. Within four years, however, he resigned his living also;¹ and, settling in

¹ The following is the entry in the books of Jesus College:—

"1710. Gul. Rosen, Londinensis, A.B., e Gallia oriundus: in cujus demortui locum successit.

"1721. Joan. Jortin, A.B., Londinensis, sed e Gallia hic quoque oriundus A.M. 1722. Taxator Academiæ, 1723. Præsentatus ad vicariam de Swavesey, 1726. Per matrimonium cessit

"1727. Georgio Lewis, A.M."

London, became reader and preacher at a chapel in New-Street, in his native parish of St. Giles in the Fields."

His residence in London opened a fair field for literary exertion; and in 1731 he set on foot, in conjunction with certain friends, a periodical publication, entitled *Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors, Ancient and Modern*. The successive numbers appeared at intervals during that and the following year, when the series was completed in two octavo volumes. From the deep research, and the sound criticism displayed in the several contributions, the work was not only well received at home, but attracted the notice of scholars abroad, and was shortly afterwards republished, in a Latin translation, at Amsterdam. Nor was this all. A new series was commenced under the superintendence of the great *Burmam*, and appeared for some time with the title of *Miscellaneæ Observationes criticæ in Auctores veteres et recentiores, ab eruditissimis Britannis inchoatæ, et nunc a doctis viris in Belgis et aliis regionibus continuatæ*. It is probable that the "Remarks on Spenser's Poems; on Milton; and on Seneca;" which were published in 1734, were drawn up for insertion in the *Observations*; on the termination of which they were given to the world in a separate form. The critiques on *Spenser* and *Milton* are elaborate and just; and they received the marked applause of *Bishop Newton* and *Mr. Warton*. From time to time, Mr. Jortin produced a variety of subsequent disquisitions, scattered about in different publications. These were collected, together with others still in MS., into two volumes, and published twenty years after his death with the following title:—"Tracts, Philological, Critical, and Miscellaneous, by Dr. Jortin, consisting of pieces, many before published separately, several annexed to the works of learned friends, and others now first printed from the author's manuscripts. London: 1790." Of those printed for the first time, the most important were *Strictures on the Articles, Subscriptions, and Tests*, and *Observations on different passages of Scripture*. Among his contributions to the works of learned friends, were "Some Remarks" on the Reformation, which may be read with undiminished interest and advantage at the present eventful crisis. They were addressed to Dr. Neve, who was preparing a reply to Philips' *Life of Cardinal Pole*;—a work, he observes, "under-

taken to recommend to us the very scum and dregs of Popery, and to vilify and calumniate the Reformation and the Reformers, in a bigoted, disingenuous, and superficial performance."

During the progress of these literary avocations, Mr. Jortin continued to hold the appointment of preacher to the chapel in New Street, till, in 1737, he was presented by the Earl of Winchilsea to the vicarage of Eastwell, in Kent. This preferment, however, he was soon compelled by the state of his health, which suffered considerably by the change, to resign; and on his return to London he was appointed preacher to a chapel of ease, attached to the parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, by his friend, Dr. Zachary Pearce, the rector. He was thus engaged, when, in 1746, he published his *Discourses concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion*, which were not merely an amplification of four Sermons which he had printed on the same subject immediately after his first arrival in London from Swavesey, but intrinsically a performance of much higher pretensions, though it has more recently been superseded by the work of Paley on the *Evidences of Christianity*, and those of other writers who have taken a more enlarged and connected view of this branch of Theological inquiry. The volume contains seven discourses, under the following heads:—1. The Prejudices of the Jews and Gentiles. 2. The Propagation of the Gospel. 3. The Kingdom of Christ. 4. The Fitness of the Time when Christ came into the World. 5. The Testimony of John the Baptist. 6. The Truth, Importance, and Authority of the Scriptures of the New Testament. 7. The Gospel considered as a Message of Grace and Truth.

In the spring of 1747, Dr. Z. Pearce was promoted to the bishopric of Bangor, and Mr. Jortin, at his request, preached the consecration sermon in Kensington Church. The publication of this sermon brought him under the notice of Archbishop Herring, with whose friendship and patronage he was honoured during that amiable prelate's life. At his instance, backed by the recommendation of Bishop Sherlock, he was selected in 1749 to preach the Boyle Lectures:—an office in which he was preceded and has been followed by some of the greatest of our great

divines. On his nomination to this appointment, he drew up a plan for his Discourses, under these four heads :—" I. Remarks on the being and perfections of God, and particularly, on his impartiality, and his goodness. II. The nature, use, and intent of Prophecy, together with an examination of some predictions in the Old and in the New Testament. III. Considerations on Miracles in general, on the miracles of Christ and his Apostles, and on the support which they give to the Christian religion. IV. The Law of Moses and the Jewish Religion set in a proper light, and defended from some objections ancient and modern." He did not, however, publish his Lectures, after their delivery, as had been the custom with his predecessors ; but out of them arose his great work, the " Remarks on Ecclesiastical History," with which the substance of the discourses on the *second* and *third* heads is incorporated. His reasons for deviating from the usual course are thus stated by himself :—" The noble and prudent *donation* of our *Christian philosopher* has had suitable effects, and produced a *printed* collection of *Religious Lectures*, which in the main may be called learned and judicious, though they are not all of equal value. The subject is copious ; but a succession of hands will at length exhaust the most copious theme, and unavoidably occasion a repetition of the same thoughts and arguments, somewhat diversified in method and in style. This, and the present cool demand for printed Sermons, may induce the Lecturers to content themselves with preaching, and to abstain from publishing. But yet, if this fashion should obtain, there may be reason to fear that, in process of time, Mr. Boyle's will have the same fate, though they deserve a better, with some other *Lectures*, and become mere *Wall-Lectures*, and discourses calculated to exist for half an hour. Between the two methods of publishing *all* or *none*, there seems to be a third, by which the discourses, being stripped of everything popular, trite, and redundant, may be thrown into the more learned and the more contracted form of *Dissertation*. This is the method which the author has attempted, and which he takes the liberty to mention : not pretending in the least to dictate, and to prescribe laws, or even to offer advice to his successors ; but only to make an apology for his own conduct,

and to inform the public, who have a right to ask and to know, how he has endeavoured to execute a trust of a public nature committed to his care."

Speaking of the design of the work, in his original preface, he describes it as intended "to produce such evidence as may support and confirm the truth of Christianity, and show that the providence of God has appeared in its establishment and in its preservation; to avoid peremptory decisions on some lately controverted questions, and seek out a way between the extremes; not to pronounce those things false which may perhaps be true, nor those things certain which are only probable, nor those things probable which are ambiguous; to try the experiment whether by this method a reader may not be gently led to grant all that is required of him, and rather more than less; to set before men some of the virtues, as well as failings, of the ancient Christians, whence they may draw practical inferences; to excite in their hearts a love for Christianity, that best gift of heaven to mankind, and a respect, though not a superstitious veneration, for those good men, who, if they could not dispute for it altogether so well as the present generation, yet, which is more, could die for it; to reject those trifles which persons of greater zeal than discernment would obtrude upon the world as golden relics of primitive Christianity; and to add several things of a miscellaneous and philological kind, which will serve, at least, to diversify the subject.—Such," he adds, "is the intention of the work: may it atone for its defects!"

That there are defects in Jortin's "Remarks," it will not be attempted to deny; and it would, perhaps, be difficult to defend him altogether from the peculiar failing with which he is charged by Dr. Hey; but the following observations from the Professor's "Divinity Lectures," are far more severe than just. "Dr. Jortin," he observes, "is a favourite author; but his *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History* do not quite hit my fancy. He appears to me in *them* to have a kind of *flippancy*, which does not suit a man of his character in other respects. It always reminds me of a school-boy, who, having acquired some talent for writing, uses it in ridiculing those from whom he has received instruction, and who ought to be the objects of his veneration and respect. He

seems, in this work, one of that class who consider *ingenuity* as consisting in pulling to pieces every thing that is established ; and *liberality of mind*, in striking out something singular, which shall relax habitual reverence, and indulge the presumption and petulance of the froward and inconsiderate. He seems to make no allowance for the customary follies and weaknesses of different ages and countries, but to try all men as if they had every advantage of modern improvement.”² Now, there are doubtless many stringent and biting sarcasms in Jortin’s volumes, and abuses are exposed and censured in plain and unvarnished terms : but they are only abuses and abominations that are so chastised, and ridicule is employed where argument would be worthless. He may not always have judged rightly, but it is impossible not to feel the sincerity of his own assurance that “his work, slight and imperfect as it is, was designed for the service of Truth.” Indeed, the very imperfections, which he admits, belong rather to the nature of the undertaking, which is not a *History*, but *Remarks* on detached portions of History, and, moreover, of *Ecclesiastical* History, which, after the three first centuries, furnishes an abundance of incidents at which one must either laugh or weep. Our author, it will be allowed, was not of the school of *Heracitus* ; but he cannot fairly be charged with having ridiculed any who have left behind them an undisputed claim to veneration and respect. The greatest defect, perhaps, of the work, as a whole, is the want of uniformity in its plan. While that portion of it which is occupied with the times preceding the death of Constantine, is characterised by judicious selection, deep research, and sound discriminative criticism ; the latter portion, which was published after his death, is little else than a record of the most striking occurrences in Church History, translated, with occasional remarks, from the narratives of previous compilers. In the former division also, the student will be amply repaid by an examination of the numerous citations from classical and ecclesiastical authors, and by the accurate and extensive learning displayed in their correction and explanation. Upon the whole, there are few productions from which the reader will derive a

² Hey’s *Lectures* : Book iv. 9. 8. See also Book iv. 21. 9.

greater share both of amusement and instruction, and few writers who more nearly approach the standard of the poet:—

Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci.³

Of the “Remarks,” the first volume of the original edition in five, appeared early in 1751, inscribed to the Earl of Burlington, as Trustee for the Lecture in which they originated; and the two next, bringing down the history to the death of Constantine, followed in 1752 and 1754, respectively. These three volumes were reprinted in two, with little or no variation, except in the size of the type, in 1767. The two posthumous volumes, which include the period between the death of Constantine and the Reformation, were published about three years after his death in 1773. Shortly after the appearance of the first volume, the author was presented by Archbishop Herring to the city Rectory of St. Dunstan in the East: and the dedication of the second volume is an elegant and appropriate acknowledgment of the many unsolicited favours for which he was indebted to his Grace. He describes these favours, and especially the more recent one, as not only “valuable in themselves, but made doubly so by the giver, by the manner, by being conferred upon one who had received few obligations of the same kind, and by settling him among those whom he had great reason to love and to esteem;” he pleads the subject upon which he was engaged, and the course of his studies, in excuse for accosting his Grace, “not with modern politeness, but with ancient simplicity;” and he concludes with a neat classical admonition to those of his readers, who might find his address deficient in that adulation upon which modern writers employ all their skill, “that it was a custom among the ancients, *not to sacrifice to heroes till after sunset.*” Nor was he unmindful of the sacrifice, when the time, at which it could be fittingly offered, arrived. After the Archbishop’s death, he paid a willing and grateful tribute to his memory in the *Life of Erasmus*, where the virtues and acquirements of the deceased prelate meet with their due meed of praise. In the mean time, the third volume of his “Remarks” had been dedicated to the same munificent patron, as “to a most candid and impartial judge” of the importance of the subjects therein dis-

³ Hor. A. P. 343.

cussed; and the manner in which they had been handled. As this dedication is, for the most part, merely a brief and characteristic summary of the contents of the volume, it may be as well to give it entire:—

“To the most Reverend Thomas, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury.

“MY LORD,

“As the foregoing volume had the advantage of appearing under the patronage of a name so highly respected and esteemed, I beg leave to present this also to your Grace, for whom alone it ever was intended.

“The Church of Christ increasing in splendour, and decreasing in virtue; the origin and progress of superstition and spiritual tyranny; the unhappy controversies which signalised the fourth century; the councils called to compose these disputes, and never answering the purposes for which they were designed; the character of the ecclesiastical historians who have transmitted to us the memory of these events; the laws of the first Christian emperor, which, like himself, had a mixture of good and bad; the accomplishment of the prophecies in the destruction of the persecutors of Christianity; the state of the Jews ever since their rejection, and the hopes which Christians entertain that God in his appointed time will show mercy and favour to his once chosen people:—these are the subjects which I have endeavoured to examine and discuss, without adulation or dissimulation, with sober liberty and disinterested inquiry, and which I offer to your Grace, with gratitude, respect, and affection, as to a most candid and impartial judge; wishing, with the public, that your health may be established, and that you may long continue an ornament and a blessing to the Church and State.

“I am, my lord, your Grace’s most obliged, and obedient humble servant, JOHN JORTIN.”

In 1755 were published “Six Dissertations” on the following subjects, theological, moral, and historical; and as such, observes the writer, “of general use and application:”—1. On the Doctrines of *Divine Assistance* and *Human Liberty*. 2. On the Controversies concerning *Predestination* and *Grace*. 3. On

the Duty of *judging candidly* and *favourably* of others and of human nature. 4. On the *Love of Praise and Reputation*, and the proper bounds and degree of that love. 5. On the history and character of *Balaam*. 6. On the *State of the Dead*, as described by *Homer* and *Virgil*. In the last of these essays a question of great classical interest is treated with much philological learning, based on a familiar acquaintance with the language, the ideas, and feelings of the ancients. It was the writer's wish to have addressed this volume also to the Archbishop of Canterbury, from whom he received, about the time of its publication, a Lambeth degree of Doctor in Divinity: "but though a parent," he remarks, "would be troublesome and presuming, who should ask his patron to stand god-father to all his children; yet he may be permitted to lay hold on any fair opportunity of obliquely recommending them to his favour and protection."

The first volume of Dr. Jortin's "*Life of Erasmus*" appeared, in 4to., in the year 1758. This valuable biography was avowedly based upon the *Life*, which Le Clerc, while engaged in editing the works of Erasmus, had drawn up in French, and inserted in the *Bibliothèque Choisie*. Compared with the work of Jortin, however, Le Clerc's performance is a mere outline, which the Doctor has filled up; and, though differing but little in their estimate of the character and opinions of the great subject of their respective memoirs, the reader will find far more copious and solid materials for the formation of his own estimate in the one than in the other. The second volume was given to the world in 1760; and a work was thus completed, which "extended the reputation of its author beyond the limits of his native country, and established his literary character in the remotest universities of Europe." These are the words of *Vicesimus Knox*, the celebrated Essayist, who was Dr. Jortin's curate, for many years, at St. Dunstan's-in-the-East. It may be here mentioned as a curious fact, sufficiently attested by the Parish Registers, that the real name of this eminent writer was *KNOCK*; being thus signed for some years by his own hand when suddenly, without any explanatory notice, it became *KNOX*, and so continued.

On the translation of Dr. Osbaldeston from the see of Carlisle

to that of London, in 1762, Dr. Jortin became his chaplain, and was almost immediately collated by his Lordship to the prebendal stall of Harleston, in St. Paul's Cathedral. Preferment was now rapidly conferred upon him. In the same year, the vicarage of Kensington became vacant, to which he was presented by the bishop; whereupon he quitted his abode in the city, and resided on his new benefice during the remainder of his life. So attached indeed did he immediately become to it, that he is said to have declined the far more valuable living of St. James, Westminster, which was offered to him by the bishop; who, about a month before his decease in 1764, gave a further proof of the high esteem in which he held both his character and acquirements, by advancing him to the Archdeaconry of London. As a preacher he had always been greatly and deservedly admired; and the charges now annually delivered to the clergy of his archdeaconry are no less remarkable than his sermons for their plain and simple eloquence, the importance of the subject discussed, their lucid arrangement, and convincing argument. During his life time, however, he could never be induced to publish his discourses, whether parochial or official; and to a friend who once asked him the reason of his refusal, he significantly replied, *They will sleep, till I sleep*. It seems therefore that he was not averse to their posthumous publication; and accordingly no less than seven octavo volumes of his "Sermons and Charges" were given to the world after his death, in the years 1771 and 1772. Speaking of his sermons, Knox observes, in his essays, that "Religion and sound morality appear in them, not indeed dressed out in the meretricious ornaments of a flowery style, but in all the manly force and simple graces of natural eloquence. They will always be read with pleasure and edification."

Dr. Jortin continued to take an active part in the ministerial duties of his two livings till within a few days of his death. He was attacked on the 27th of August with an affection of the chest and lungs, attended with difficulty of breathing. His complaint, however, produced little actual suffering, though it resisted every remedy which medical skill could suggest; and he breathed his last, in full possession of his mental faculties, on the 8th of September, in the seventy-second year of his age.

Not long before his departure, he observed to an attendant who offered him some nourishment, that he had *enough of everything*; and without any apparent struggle, passed *through death, unto life*. His remains were interred at Kensington, according to directions which he had left in writing :—"Bury me in a private manner by daylight, at Kensington, in the church, or rather in the new churchyard, and lay a flat stone over the grave. Let the inscription be only thus :⁴—

JOANNES JORTIN

MORTALIS ESSE DESIIT

ANNO SALUTIS [MDCCLXX]

ÆTATIS [LXXII]."

His widow, who died on the 24th of June, 1778, was buried by his side.

Two children survived their parents :—a son and a daughter. The son, *Rogers Jortin, Esq.*, of Lincoln's-Inn, held a post under government, as one of the four attorneys in his Majesty's Exchequer Office of Pleas. There is a tablet in the chancel of St. Dunstan's-in-the-East, inscribed to the memory of his wife, Anne Jortin, who died in 1774, in her thirty-seventh year. On the same stone are also records of William and Ann Prowting; of whom she was the child. Mr. Prowting, formerly a surgeon in the parish, was the first treasurer, and one of the founders, of St. Luke's Hospital for Lunatics. He died in September, 1794, aged eighty-six years; and his wife, in January, 1780, aged seventy-five; leaving a daughter, Elizabeth Robinson, who died in 1819, at the age of seventy-nine. Mr. Jortin married a second wife, Louisa, daughter of Dr. Maty, principal librarian of the British Museum. It appears from another tablet in the chancel of St. Dunstan's, that she survived her husband, who died in 1795, aged sixty-three, nearly

⁴ It is a very probable conjecture of the present rector of St. Dunstan's, the *Rev. T. B. Murray*,—a valued college friend, to whom the Editor is indebted for some interesting particulars of Jortin's incumbency—that the somewhat remarkable thought, "*Mortalis esse desiit*," may have been suggested by a very similar expression which occurs in an inscription on a flat stone in the chancel. A long and well-written notice of one *Francis March*, a Turkey merchant, is thus beautifully closed :—"Ineluctabili morbo cessit, et mortalitati non vitæ valedixit, 10 Novembr. 1697. Ætat. 62."

fourteen years. The same stone records the death of their youngest son, Samuel; and of the doctor's daughter, Martha, who was married to the Rev. Samuel Darby, formerly fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, and rector of Whatfield, near Hadleigh, in Suffolk. She died on the 21st of March, 1817, aged eighty-six.

There is now residing in Mincing-lane, a parishioner of St. Dunstan's, whose father had a perfect recollection of Dr. Jortin, as rector, and used to speak of him as a *grave, mild person*, who was on terms of intimacy with the family. This is precisely the description which the pursuits and habits of the man would seem to verify. His literary labours would naturally induce a sedate gravity of deportment; and the relief which he sought from the fatigues of study in the cultivation of a taste for music, would cherish that placid gentleness of disposition for which he seems to have been remarkable. He is said to have been a skilful player on the harpsichord; and his devotion to the science is sufficiently perceptible in a "Letter concerning the Music of the Ancients," which is one of the earlier productions of his pen. As a writer, he has been very generally admired, though in one respect, as already mentioned, somewhat harshly condemned. There is, however, high authority for the more favourable estimate which has been given in this memoir of his literary character. "As to Jortin," says Dr. Parr, "whether I look back to his verse, to his prose, to his critical or to his theological works, there are few authors, to whom I am so much indebted for rational entertainment, or for solid instruction."

REMARKS

UPON

ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FROM 1789 TO 1861
BY HENRY REEVE

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FROM 1789 TO 1861
BY HENRY REEVE

REMARKS

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FROM 1789 TO 1861
BY HENRY REEVE

ECCLIESIALISTICAL HISTORY

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FROM 1789 TO 1861
BY HENRY REEVE

REMARKS
UPON
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

I. CIRCUMSTANCES FAVOURABLE TO THE EARLY PROPAGATION
OF THE GOSPEL.

It has been often observed that Christianity made its appearance in the most proper time, and under a favourable concurrence of circumstances.¹

Christianity began to gain ground in Judæa and its neighbourhood in the reign of Tiberius, a very wicked prince, but who was so occupied with his lusts and with his cruelty towards considerable persons whom he hated, envied, or feared, and was also naturally so slow and indolent, that either he heard little

¹With respect to the fitness of the time at which Christianity made its appearance, the civilisation, which everywhere accompanied the progress of Roman conquest, was favourable to the extension of a religion, which aimed at a moral dominion no less universal than the empire which the arms of the Cæsars had now achieved. The tendency of the Pagan superstitions to degrade the human mind, and the demoralising effects of the prevailing Epicurism,—against which the severities of the Stoics and refinements of the Platonists exercised, if any, the most trifling influence,—had yet contributed to arouse all but the most abandoned to the necessity of a reformation, and thus to prepare the way for the reception of the doctrines of the Gospel, at a period when the union of so many nations under one power would facilitate their propagation. It has been said, indeed, that the gradual development of the powers of the human understanding resulted, as it were, spontaneously in the Christian system ; but the time, however fitted for the reception of the Gospel, was altogether inadequate to its production. Not only was Christianity before the age in which it appeared, but it has remained in advance of the highest moral perfection to which the mind of man has yet attained, or, without its aid, is capable of attaining.—EDIT.

of this remote and rising sect, or thought it beneath his notice, and so did it no harm.

It is probable that Pilate, who had no enmity towards Christ, and accounted him a man unjustly accused, and an extraordinary person,² might be moved by the wonderful circumstances attending and following his death to hold him in veneration, and perhaps to think him a hero, and the son of some deity. It is possible that he might send a narrative, such as he thought most convenient, of these transactions to Tiberius; but it is not at all likely³ that Tiberius proposed to the Senate that Christ should be deified, and that the Senate rejected it, and that Tiberius continued favourably disposed towards Christ, and that he threatened to punish those who should molest and accuse the Christians. This report rests principally upon the authority of Tertullian,⁴ who was very capable of being deceived, and

² See Matt. xxvi. 23, 24. Mark xv. 14. Luke xxiii. 4.—EDIT.

³ See *Le Clerc*, Hist. Eccl. p. 324.

⁴ Tertull. Apol. c. 5. *Tiberius ergo, cujus tempore nomen Christianum in sæculum introivit, annuntiatum sibi ex Syria Palæstina, quod illic veritatem illius (J. C.) divinitatis revelaverat, detulit ad senatum cum prærogativa suffragii sui (scilicet, ut deus consecraretur). Senatus, quia non ipse probaverat, respuit; Cæsar in sententia mansit, comminatus periculum accusatoribus Christianorum.* And again, in c. 21, *Ea omnia super Christo Pilatus, et ipse jam pro sua conscientia Christianus, Cæsari tum Tiberio nuntiavit. Sed et Cæsares credidissent super Christo, si aut Cæsares non essent sæculo necessarii, aut si et Christiani potuissent esse Cæsares.* Upon this point there has been considerable difference of opinion among the learned. The Abbé de Houteville, in his “Christian Religion proved by Facts” (c. 10), and Christopher Iscelin, in an Essay published in the “Bibliothèque Germanique” (tom. 32, p. 147, and tom. 33, p. 12), regard the proposition of Tiberius to the senate as a fact; and Lardner (*Heathen Testimonies*, c. 2), coincides in opinion with Bishop Pearson (Lect. in Act. Apost. iv. § 15), that it is very far from being improbable. It is clear, not only from the memorable letters of Pliny to Trajan, but from the daily journal (*ὑπομνηματικὰ ἐφημερίδες*), which, according to Philo, was transmitted to Caligula from the præfect in Alexandria, that Pilate would only have acted in accordance with his duty, in forwarding to the emperor an account of the proceedings which had taken place in Judæa respecting Christ. Indeed there is the strongest reason to believe that he did so. Justin Martyr (Apol. I. cc. 35, 48), refers to certain “Acts of Pontius Pilate,” in proof of his statements concerning the sufferings and death of Christ; and assuredly he would never have ventured to challenge a public document, of which he had not fully ascertained the existence. Possibly it was this appeal to them which caused their destruction; for those which are now extant are unquestionably spurious, and their dissemination seems to have suggested a counter forgery on the part of the enemies of Christianity, of which the Emperor Maximin availed himself to cast discredit upon its divine founder. (See Euseb. Hist. Eccl. i. 9, ix. 5;

Eusebius had it from him.⁵ The ancient Christians might have been misinformed in this, as in some other points. Tiberius was of an irreligious disposition and a fatalist, and little disposed to increase the number of the Gods and the burden of Atlas:—*circa deos ac religiones negligentior, quippe addictus mathematicæ; persuasionisque plenus cuncta fato agi.*⁶ He hated foreign superstitions, Egyptian and Jewish rites:—*externas cæremonias, Ægyptios Judaicosque ritus compescuit.*⁷ He and the Senate had expelled the Jews from Rome,⁸ and about the time of Christ's crucifixion he had destroyed an illustrious family, for this, amongst other reasons, that divine honours had been paid to one Theophanes, an ancestor of theirs. *Datum erat crimini quod Theophanem Mitylenæum proavum eorum Cn. Magnus inter intimos habuisset: quodque defuncto Theophani cælestes honores Græca adulatio tribuerat.*⁹ Augustus commended Caius for not worshipping at Jerusalem:—*Caium nepotem, quod Judæam prætervehens, apud Hierosolymam non supplicasset, collaudavit:*¹ and Tiberius made it a rule, *omnia facta dictaque ejus vice legis observare*, as he says of himself in *Tacitus*.² Observe also that the Jews persecuted the Apostles and slew Stephen, and that Saul made havoc of the Church, entering into every

Routh's Reliq. Sacr. iii. p: 286.) Still it is not without reason that Jortin attaches little credit to the assertion of Tertullian, which rests upon no other testimony than his own, that Tiberius was induced by the report of Pilate to seek the admission of Christ among the deities of Rome. Gibbon agrees with Le Clerc in rejecting the story; and the Bishop of Lincoln (Tertull. c. 2, p. 112) considers it "liable to just suspicion." "How happened it," he asks, "that so remarkable a fact, as a public proposal from the emperor to the senate to receive Christ among the gods of Rome, escaped the notice of every other writer?" Tertullian himself not only does not pretend that Tiberius was a convert to Christianity; but the last of the passages above cited points somewhat obscurely to the motives, whether of avarice or ambition, which stood in the way of his conversion. He may have adopted a current tradition too hastily, from its strict accordance with the conduct of the senate on other occasions (Suet. Tiber. c. 31); and from the considerations that subsequent emperors, as recorded by Lampridius, a Pagan writer of the fourth century, entertained similar views with regard to the enrolment of Christ among the gods. Paulus Orosius also, an historian of the fifth century (vii. 4), mentions the proposition of Tiberius, and attributes its failure to the influence of the emperor's favourite, Sejanus, who vehemently opposed the innovation. His account, however, is so manifestly derived from Tertullian, that both must stand or fall together.—EDIT.

⁵ Eccl. Hist. ii. 2.⁶ Sueton. Tiber. 69.⁷ Ibid. c. 36.⁸ Tacitus, Suetonius, Josephus.⁹ Tacit. Ann. vi. 18.¹ Sueton. Aug. 93.² Ann. iv. 37.

house, and haling men and women committed them to prison, and that Pilate connived at all this violence, and was not afraid of the resentment of Tiberius on that account.³

The custom which the Romans had to deify and adore their emperors, most of them after their decease, and some of them during their lives, even though they were the vilest of mankind ;—the apotheosis of Antinous, Adrian's favourite ;—the contempt which many emperors, as Tiberius, and Caius, and 'Nero shewed towards their Gods ;—the endeavour of 'Heliogabalus to suppress the worship of the ancient deities, and to introduce a ridiculous god of his own ;—the strange Egyptian deities which had crept into Italy, and were there adored by some and detested by others ;—the liberty which many learned persons⁶ had taken with the popular religion ;—these things had a tendency to wean the

³ The fact is, that even had Tiberius made such a proposal to the Senate as the Deification of Christ, he could not have expected them to sanction it. Much has been said of the *tolerance* of Paganism ; but it was tolerance of such rites as would readily amalgamate with the national polytheism, not of such as were opposed to it. An old law, which was never repealed, is cited by Cicero (de Leg. ii. 8) : *Separatim nemo habessit Deos, neve novos ; sed ne advenas, nisi publice adscitos, privatim colunto*. In this spirit of legislation, Livy (iv. 30) relates that the Ædiles received a charge (B. C. 430), *ut animadverterent, ne qui, nisi Romani dii, neu quo alio more quam patrio, colerentur*. Valerius Maximus also, in the reign of Tiberius, speaks of the jealousy with which foreign systems of religion were rejected at Rome (i. 3) ; and some instances of the prevailing hatred against that of Egypt in particular, against which the law was frequently put in force, are given by Jortin in the text.—EDIT.

⁴ Suet. Ner. 56. *Religionum usquequaque contemtor, præter unius Deæ Syriæ. Hanc mox ita sprexit, ut urinâ contaminaret*.

⁵ Lamprid. 3. *Heliogabalum in Palatino monte juxta ædes imperatorias consecravit, eique templum fecit, studens et Matris typum, et Vestæ ignem, et Palladium, et ancilia, et omnia Romanis veneranda in illud transferre templum : et id agens, ne quis Romæ deus nisi Heliogabalus coleretur*.

⁶ It is related somewhere of Diogenes the Cynic, that, to show his contempt of sacrifices, he took a louse, and cracked it upon the altar of Diana.

[The popular religion, indeed, was very generally regarded by the higher classes merely as a political contrivance for controlling the passions of the multitude ; and writers frequently apologised for adverting to the superstitious legends of the popular creed, which men of education could only be supposed to sanction, in compliance with the prejudices of the vulgar. (See Polyb. vi. 56 ; Strabo, i. p. 19.) It is thus a matter of surprise to the Epicurean in Cicero, that "one haruspex can look into another's face without laughing ;" and Juvenal speaks of the ancient belief as almost universally exploded in *Sat. II. 149*.

*Esse aliquid Manes et subterranea regna,
Et contum, et Stygio ranas in gurgite nigras,*

Pagans by slow degrees from their attachment to idolatry, and to facilitate the worship of one God and Father of all, (who, by his Son, or his Word, reconciled to himself and instructed mankind, and by his Spirit assisted virtuous minds in their progress to wisdom and happiness,) as a religion more simple, and noble, and philosophical, and reasonable than Paganism.

The Senate, says Dio, ordered the temples of Isis and Serapis to be pulled down, and afterwards would not suffer any to be erected *intra pomærium*. Τοὺς ναοὺς, οὓς ἰδίᾳ τινὲς ἐπεποίηντο, καθελεῖν τῇ Βούλῃ ἔδοξεν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐνόμισαν· καὶ ὅτε γε καὶ ἐξενίκησεν, ὥστε καὶ δημοσίᾳ αὐτοὺς σέβεσθαι, ἔξω τοῦ πωμηρίου σφᾶς ἰδρύσαντο. A little after the civil war between Cæsar and Pompey, the *Haruspices* ordered the temples of these deities to be demolished. How much the goddess Isis and her sacred rites were despised may be seen in Propertius, Lucan, and Juvenal; not to mention several others.⁷ The apotheosis of the Roman Emperors is made the subject of the utmost contempt and ridicule by Seneca in his Ἀποκολοκύντωσις.⁸

The Romans knew not much of Christianity, and in a great measure overlooked it, till its professors were so considerably increased, that they could not easily be destroyed. Christianity at first was more likely to prosper under bad than under good emperors, if these were tenacious of their religious rites and ceremonies. The bad emperors had usually other crimes and other mischief in view, and no leisure to plague such a little

Atque unâ transire vadum tot millia cymbâ ;

Nec pueri credunt, nisi qui nondum ære lavantur.

Nor indeed were the deities safe even from the insults of the rabble, if they failed to afford them protection, or grant their prayers. On the day that Germanicus died, the temples of the gods were stoned, the altars overthrown, and some of the household *lares* cast into the streets. Sueton. Calig. c. 5. *Quo defunctus est die, lapidata sunt templa, subversæ deûm aræ, Lares a quibusdam familiares in publicum abjecti.* Such also was the rage of the Lesbians at the defeat of Pompey, that *littore toto plangitur ; infestæ tenduntur in æthera dextræ.* (Lucan. Ph. viii. 149.)—EDIT.]

⁷ See Dio, c. xl. p. 142 ; xlii. p. 196. Propert. ii. 24. Lucan. Ph. viii. 831 ; ix. 158. Juv. Sat. vi. 489, 526 ; ix. 22 ; xv. 8.

⁸ In this curious satire, though mainly directed against the Emperor Claudius, Augustus is made to tell the gods that, *dum tales deos facitis, nemo vos deos esse credet.* It was not, indeed, without considerable opposition, that divine honours were conferred upon the emperors ; and Tiberius, more wise than his predecessor, refused, except on one occasion, to accept them. See Tacit. Ann. i. 10 ; iv. 15, 37 ; v. 2.—EDIT.

sect, little when compared to paganism. And accordingly, from the death of Christ to Vespasian, for about the space of thirty-seven years, the Romans did not much mind the progress of the Gospel. They were ruled by weak, or frantic, and vicious emperors; and the magistrates and senators, and every worthy man of any note, stood in continual fear for their own lives. Under Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, the empire was a scene of confusion, desolation, and misery. Nero indeed destroyed several Christians at Rome, but it was for a supposed crime of which all the world knew them to be innocent; so that this cruel treatment raised compassion, and rather did service than harm to the Christian cause, and the persecution was soon over.⁹

If Claudius and the senate in his time had known the nature of the Gospel in this point, that it was directly opposite to the national religion, and that, if it prospered, paganism must decline and come to nothing, and that every Christian thought himself bound to spread his opinions by all arts and means which were not immoral, they would have endeavoured to suppress it effec-

⁹ Much difference of opinion has been expressed concerning the severity and extent of the Neronian persecution; but perhaps our author's estimate is tolerably correct. Gibbon (c. 16) asserts that "the effects as well as the cause of this persecution were confined to the walls of Rome;" in which opinion he was preceded by Le Clerc (Hist. Eccl. A. D. 64), who has maintained the point with considerable force of argument; and Dr. Burton agrees with Dodwell in a conclusion very similar to that at which Dr. Jortin has also arrived. But the charge of incendiarism, in which the persecution originated, would not necessarily limit the barbarities described by Tacitus (Ann. xv. 14) to the city which the Christians were said to have destroyed; and they may well be supposed to have extended, during the space of four years over which they are said to have been spread, far beyond the spot where they first were perpetrated. Tertullian also mentions certain laws enacted by Nero against the Christians (Apol. cc. 5, 7; Ad Nation. i. 7), which tend to prove that the particular charge in question was followed up by more general accusations, and consequently by more general calamities. At the same time, Tertullian may very probably allude to existing edicts, of which Nero had temporarily availed himself; for there is nothing in the Roman historian to indicate that the assault was less transient than furious. Neither is there any direct testimony to its universality prior to that of Sulpicius (ii. p. 146), and Orosius (vii. 7), in the fifth century; for the Lusitanian inscription, according to which Nero "purged that province from those, *qui novam generi humano superstitionem inculcabant*," is confessedly spurious. Whether confined to Rome, however, or extended over the empire, the effects of the outrage were sufficiently disastrous; since, independently of an immense multitude of less illustrious victims, it was closed by the martyrdom both of St. Peter and St. Paul, who suffered, according to tradition, on the same day.—EDIT.

tually; but it lay screened then under Judaism, and the Jews had leave to worship God in their own way.

The Christians who suffered under Nero are called *malefici* by Suetonius; that is, *sorcerers, magicians*.¹ Probably the pagans had heard of their miracles, and ascribed them to magic arts, which yet was a kind of indirect acknowledgment of them.

Quid Romæ faciam? mentiri nescio: motus

Astrorum ignoro: funus promittere patris, &c.—JUVENAL, iii. 41.

Where the old scholiast says, *motus astrorum*—*maleficus non sum*. But here I doubt it should be, *Mathematicus non sum*; which is a more literal interpretation.

Nemo mathematicus genium indemnatus habebit.—

Consulti ictericæ lento de funere matris;

Ante tamen de te, &c.—JUVENAL, vi. 562.

With the reader's leave, I will step out of my way to correct a passage in this poet (xiii. 64):—

Egregium sanctumque virum si cerno, bimembri

Hoc monstrum puero, vel *mirandis* sub aratro

Piscibus inventis, et foetæ comparo mulæ,

Sollicitus, tanquam lapides effuderit imber,

Examenque apium longa consederit uva

Culmine delubri, tanquam in mare fluxerit amnis

Gurgitibus *miris*, et lactis vortice torrens.

Henninius has given in the text *mirandis*. Lubin says we must read *mirantis*, not *miranti*. Gataker conjectures *liranti*. These honest men were all disposed to feed upon acorns; whilst other copies had *miranti*, which was very well explained by Britannicus, *sub aratro miranti, ut rei inanimæ dederit sensum*. *Miranti*

¹ Suet. Ner. c. 16. *Afflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novæ et maleficæ*. It should seem then that the epithet is applied to the *religion itself*, not to its professors; and, so applied, it will doubtless include the calumny, so assiduously propagated, that the miracles of Christ and his followers were wrought by magical agency. It was even asserted that our Lord had composed a treatise on magic for the use of the Apostles (Augustin. de consensu Evang. i. 9); and Justin Martyr (Apol. i. 30) assigns the popular prejudice on this head, as a reason for laying the chief stress of evidence in support of the divine mission of Christ on the fulfilment of prophecy. As applied to Christians themselves, the term *malefici* indicates the flagrant immoralities with which they were charged; and which gave rise to a variety of offensive appellations, for the origin and import of which the reader is referred to Bingham (Antiquities, i. 2), and the authorities which he has cited. The illustration from Juvenal, cited in the text with the exposition of the old scholiast, does not throw much light on the subject.—EDIT.

aratro is just such an expression as *irato sistro* (XIII. 93); *esuriens ramus olivæ* (XIII. 99); &c. &c.²

I need not observe how flat and unmeaning, and unpoetical, is the expression *Gurgitibus miris*, and how ill it comes in after *miranti*. The poet intended to speak of a prodigy, of a river running bloody, which, together with showers of blood, has been often mentioned amongst prodigies.³ The word which he used was somewhat uncommon, and therefore lost, and ill supplied. He wrote, I believe, *Gurgitibus miniis, et lactis vortice torrens*: that is *sanguineis, rubris instar minii*. The adjective *minius*, or *mineus*, from *minium*, red lead, vermillion, is twice used by Apuleius: *fulgentium rosarum minius color*; and, *cervicula psittaci circulo mineo*.⁴ If there were no example extant of the adjective *minius*, that would not be a sufficient reason to reject the emendation, since the Greek and Latin poets frequently turn substantives into adjectives.⁵ So Juvenal himself, Sat. xi. 94 (according to the best copies): *Qualis in Oceano fluctu testudo nataret*. 113. *Litore ab Oceano Gallis venientibus*. Catullus, LXIII. (according to Scaliger's emendation): *Nimirum Oceano se ostendit Noctifer imbre*. And hence Milton, i. *Hugest that swim th' Ocean stream*. *Minium* in Greek is *μῖλτος*, and the Sibylline oracles speak thus of a bloody shower: *Καὶ ψεκάδες πίπτωσιν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, οἷά τε μῖλτος*.

The old Scholiast says, *Gurgitibus miris—aut lacteis, aut sanguineis*. But you have nothing in Juvenal that answers to *sanguineis*, unless you change *miris* into *miniis*, which is also a

² Without question, *miranti*, not *mirandis*, is the true reading. There is nothing remarkable in the fish themselves, but their unwonted situation constitutes the prodigy, which is increased by the surprise attributed to the inanimate plough. *Mirantis*, sc. *aratoris*, is tame in the extreme; and *liranti*, i. e., *making the furrow*, is little better. Neither is this verb found in any good author.—EDIT.

³ See Cic. de Divin. i. 43. [ii. 58]; Dio c. lxii. 1; Liv. xxii. 1, xxiv. 10, xxvi. 45; Plin. N. H. ii. 56; V. Max. i. 6; Virg. Georg. i. 485. Compare also Exod. vii. 20; Ps. lxxviii. 44, cv. 29.—EDIT.

⁴ Faber's Thesaurus.

⁵ Though it is true that substantives are not unfrequently employed as adjectives, yet our author has chosen his examples somewhat unfortunately. In the two first, the correct reading is, in all probability, *oceanis*; and that from Catullus is inapplicable. Indeed, this conjecture, however ingenious, is alike improbable and unnecessary. The old scholiast's *sanguineis* points to the nature of the miracle, not the meaning of the word; but whether *miris* refers to the violence or the colour of the waters, the text is a very good text as it stands.—EDIT.

very slight alteration. The Poet might have so contrived it as to have used *sanguis* or *cruor*, or their adjectives, but *gurgitibus miniis* pleased him better, as it had a more ludicrous cast, and he chose rather to stain his river with red ochre than with blood. It threw a contempt upon portents and prodigies, things which he was not much disposed to believe. Lucian, or whosoever he be who wrote the treatise *De Dea Syria*, says that the river Adonis was stained with blood every year, ὁ δὲ ποταμὸς ἐκάστου ἔτεος αἰμάσσεται, καὶ, τὴν χροίην ὀλέσας, ἐσπίπτει ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ φοινίσσει τὸ πολλὸν τοῦ πελάγους.⁶ He adds that an inhabitant of Byblus explained the phenomenon thus: ὁ Ἀδωνις ὁ πόταμος, ὃ ξεῖνε, διὰ τοῦ Λιβάνου ἔρχεται· ὁ δὲ Λίβανος κάρτα ξανθογεὺς ἐστι· ἄνεμοι ὧν τρηχέες ἐκείνησι τῇσι ἡμέρησι ἰστάμενοι τὴν γῆν τῷ ποταμῷ ἐπιφέρουσι, εὐσαν ἐς τὰ μάλιστα μιλωδέα (*minio similem*): ἡ δὲ γῆ μιν αἰμωδέα τίθησι. This account has been since confirmed by Maundrel in his *Voyages*. *Sanguinem pluisse*, says Cicero, *senatui nuntiatum est: Atratum etiam fluvium fluxisse sanguine.*—*Sed et decoloratio quædam ex aliqua contagione terrena potest sanguini similis esse.*⁷

Some may think that we ought to read *Gurgitibus miniis*, aut *lactis vortice torrens*, instead of *et*. But, unless the best manuscripts deceive us, *et* is often used in a disjunctive sense, and implies much the same as *aut*; and likewise *que*, where *ve* might seem more proper. Of this I gave some examples in the *Miscell. Observ.* vol. ii. p. 255.

II. OF THE DÆMONIACS.

Amongst the miracles recorded in the *Acts of the Apostles* is the casting out of evil spirits.⁸ In the New Testament, where

⁶ c. 8.

⁷ De Div. ii. 27.

⁸ Acts xvi. 16, 18. On the subject of the *Dæmoniaks of the New Testament*, the reader is referred to the writings of Farmer, Mede, Lardner, and Neander, on the one hand, and of Macknight, Adam Clarke, and Doddridge, on the other. It appears almost impossible, upon a candid examination of the question, to withstand the overpowering weight of evidence in favour of the reality of dæmoniacal possession, at least in the apostolical age. To suppose that the unhappy victims, mentioned in the Gospels, were labouring under a species of insanity, induced by the leprosy and other cutaneous disorders, so frequent in Judæa; that the lunatic spoke the language suggested by the prevailing belief in the power of evil spirits; and that our Lord and the evangelists fell in with the popular mode of speaking, while they knew the persons to be subject to an ordinary disease—seems to argue a perversity of judg-

any circumstances are added concerning the Dæmoniacs, they are generally such as show that there was something *præternatural* in the distemper; for these disordered persons agreed in one story, and paid homage to Christ and to his Apostles, which is not to be expected from madmen, of whom some would have worshipped, and others would have reviled Christ, according to the various humour and behaviour observable in such persons.

One reason for which the divine Providence should suffer evil spirits to exert their malignant powers so much at that time, might be to give a check to Sadduceism amongst the Jews, and to Epicurean atheism amongst the Gentiles, and to remove in some measure these two great impediments to the reception of the Gospel.

III. THE GIFT OF TONGUES.

The first miracle after the ascension of Christ, namely the *Gift of Tongues*, was of singular and extraordinary service to Christianity. It increased the number of believers at Jerusalem, and engaged the admiration and favour of the people so much, that the enemies of Christ could not accomplish their designs against the disciples, and it served to convey the Gospel to distant regions.

It has been said that the gift of tongues continued for a considerable time to be absolutely necessary for the spreading of Christianity; but it is to be observed that the Scriptures never say so. We may therefore judge for ourselves how far it was needful. Now at the time of Pentecost there was a great resort of Jews and Proselytes from various and remote countries. The

ment, which nothing but the most inveterate prejudice in favour of the Neologian theory of the German school could produce. On the other hand, it is easy to conceive that, in later times, the statements of the evangelist would lead persons of distempered minds to fancy themselves possessed, and others to attribute the phenomena of natural disease to supernatural causes. On this point, our author has some good observations in some of his subsequent remarks. The probable reason of the extraordinary powers permitted to evil spirits in the early days of the Gospel dispensation is well stated by Mr. Horne (*Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures*), who has also given a lucid but concise view of the entire question. (See also Bishop Porteus on Matthew, Lect. x.; Warburton's Works, vol. 6, pp. 329, &c.; and, particularly on the rationalist side, Jahn's *Biblical Antiquities*, and Winer's *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, art. *Besessene*.)—EDIT.

gift of tongues conferred upon the disciples served to convince and convert many of these persons, and these persons served to carry Christianity with them to their several homes. Afterwards the Ethiopian Eunuch, Cornelius the Roman Centurion, Sergius Paulus the proconsul, Dionysius the Areopagite, and many others, were converted. By these persons, and by the travels of some of the Apostles and of their disciples, Christianity was spread in the Roman empire and in the East; and then the Greek language, together with human industry in learning other tongues, might be sufficient to convey the Gospel as far and as soon as Providence intended.⁹

Apollonius Tyaneus, as 'Philostratus relates, pretended to understand all languages without having learned them. If Philostratus may be credited in this, it is probable that Apollonius, knowing that the Christians claimed this gift, took the same honour to himself. He flourished in the times of Nero and of Domitian, and it is to be supposed that he could speak a little of several tongues, for he was a man of parts and a strolling vagabond.² Philostratus also assures us, that, when the mother

⁹ This seems to be the most sober and rational view of the matter. Doubtless the gift continued in the church as long as its early exigencies required preternatural assistance, gradually subsiding into those ordinary influences which the Spirit still exerts upon the Christian missionary. It has been remarked, that as the progress of idolatry was checked at Babel by the confusion of languages, so was the propagation of the gospel facilitated by their miraculous diffusion. With respect to the miracle itself, some have thought that it was wrought upon the *hearers*, to whom the apostles, speaking in Hebrew, *appeared* to speak in the native tongues of those whom they addressed. As a candid perusal of the sacred narrative would show this notion to be untenable, so will it demolish the absurd speculations of those who would set aside the miracle altogether, and place it on a par with the unintelligible ravings of the late *Mr. Irving* and his disciples. A concise view of the Neologian theories of Eichorn, Semlis, and other divines of the German school, will be found, together with their refutation, in Kuinoel's commentary on the passage (Acts ii.).—EDIT.

¹ Vit. Apoll. p. 25. ed. Par. or Euseb. contr. Hier. p. 517.

² Apollonius of Tyana was a mystic philosopher of the school of Pythagoras, who was very generally believed to have been endued with supernatural powers, and is said to have announced the death of the tyrant Domitian to the people of Ephesus at the very instant of its occurrence. His life was written by Philostratus, at the command of Caracalla and his empress, Julia Domma, who were devotedly attached to the art of magic; but whether as a rival to the gospel history, may fairly admit of doubt. (See Ratter's *Hist. of Philos.*, t. iv., p. 492.) Many of the miracles, indeed, with which his name is connected, such as his extraordinary incarnation, his healing the sick, casting out devils, and raising the dead, are strangely coincident with those of our blessed Lord. It should seem, however, that his biographer, who

of Apollonius was in labour, the swans came to attend and assist her; for which he produces no voucher, says Eusebius.³ Now Philostratus, or whosoever was the author of this pretty story, stole the thought from Callimachus; where these poetical birds perform the same office to Latona:—

Κύκνοι δὲ θεοῦ μέλποντες αἰδοὶ
Μηρόνιον Πακτωλὸν ἐκυκλώσαντο λιπόντες
Ἑβδομάκις περὶ Δῆλον ἐπήεισαν δὲ λοχείῃ
Μουσάων ὄρνιθες, αἰοιδότατοι πετεηνῶν.—H. in Del. 249.

Clemens Alexandrinus cites Plato as saying that the gods or dæmons had the use of language, and that it appeared from the discourses of dæmoniacs, since in those possessions it was not the man himself, but the dæmon in him, who spake by the man's voice. Ὁ Πλάτων δὲ καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς διάλεκτον ἀπονέμει τινὰ, μάλιστα μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀνειράτων τεκμαιρόμενος καὶ τῶν χρησμῶν· ἄλλως δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν δαιμονίωντων, οἱ τὴν αὐτῶν οὐ φθέγγονται φωνὴν οὐδὲ διάλεκτον, ἀλλὰ τὴν τῶν ὑπεισιόντων δαιμόνων.⁴ I may have overlooked it, but I never could find this place in Plato. There is something a little like it in Porphyry, where Apollo says of himself, Ἀυλοῦ δ' ἐκ βροτέοιο φίλην ἐτεκνώσατο φωνήν.⁵ On which the philosopher observes, Πνεῦμα γὰρ τὸ κατιόν, καὶ ἀπόρροια ἐκ τῆς ἐπουρανίου δυνάμεως, εἰς ὀργανικὸν σῶμα καὶ ἔμψυχον εἰσελθούσα, βάσει χρωμένη τῇ ψυχῇ, διὰ τοῦ σώματος, ὡς ὄργανον, φωνὴν ἀποδίδωσιν.⁶ These δαιμονῶντες, of whom the philosophers speak,

paid a divided worship to Christ and Apollonius, has garnished the real history of the philosopher, obtained from authentic sources, with a mass of incongruous fiction, partly founded on the Gospel narratives, and partly borrowed from the marvellous histories and traditions of the time. Be the object of the philosopher, however, what it might, Hierocles, an anti-Christian writer of the fourth century, instituted a comparison between the miracles recorded in his biography and those of Christ, with a view to depreciate the latter, and bring Christianity into contempt. "If Jesus Christ raised the dead," he asks, "did not Apollonius command the tombs to open? And if Christ ascended into heaven, did not Apollonius the same?" Although Eusebius of Cæsarea gave a full and decisive answer to this book of Hierocles, entitled Λόγος φιλαλήθης πρὸς Χριστιανούς, it is well known that an attempt to revive the attack was made by an English infidel, Lord Herbert, of Cherbury. Now an admission of the reality of our Lord's miracles lies at the very basis of the comparison, and consequently proves the very fact of his divine mission, which it is the object of these writers to refute.—EDIT.

³ In Hierocl. p. 517.

⁴ Strom. i. p. 405. Oxon. Edit.

⁵ φίλην φωνήν. This may be translated *suam vocem*. Ἐτεκνώσατο. Fors. ἐτεχνώσατο, vel ἐτεχνήσατο, vel τεχνήσατο.

⁶ Apud Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* v. 8.

were persons inspired, or supposed to be inspired by Apollo, Cybele, or other Dæmons. In later times the speaking of new languages has been reckoned one of the proofs of being possessed with a dæmon.⁷

To learn a foreign language so far as to understand it when we read or hear it, is a skill which is not to be acquired without much time and pains. To speak it readily and pronounce it rightly, is still more difficult: it is what many persons can never accomplish, though they have all the proper helps, as we may see every day; nor can any study and application acquire this habit, unless there be an opportunity of conversing frequently with those whose tongue it is. If the Apostles on the day of Pentecost had expressed themselves improperly, or with a bad accent, as most people do, when they speak a living language which is not natural to them, the hearers, who at that time were not converted to Christianity, would have suspected some fraud, would have taken notice of such⁸ faults, and censured them; which since they did not, it is to be supposed that they had nothing of that kind to object.

IV. PROPHECIES OF CHRIST RESPECTING THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

1. *Proof and means of their fulfilment.*—Within forty years after the resurrection of Christ (A.D. 70.) came on the destruction of Jerusalem, a most important event, upon which the credit and the fate of Christianity depended. Christ had foretold it so expressly, that, if he had failed, his religion could not have supported itself. But his predictions were exactly accomplished, and proved him to be a true prophet. Christ fixed the time also, saying that the days were at hand, and would come before that generation should pass away, and whilst the daughters of Jerusalem, or their children, should be living.

⁷ See Bayle's Dict. Grandier, and Michael Psellus de Operat. Dæmonum, and some instances collected by Cudworth, *Intell. Syst.* p. 704, 5. That from Fernelius is mentioned by Le Clerc, in his extracts from Cudworth, *Bibl. Chois.* v. p. 109. He has made a small mistake when he says, *Un Mélancolique que les Médecins avoient traité en vain, et qui ne savoit ni Grec ni Latin, se mit à parler ces deux langues.* Fernelius only says that the young gentleman did not understand Greek.

⁸ As the Jews did to Peter, when they said to him, *Thou art a Galilæan, and thy speech bewrayeth thee* (Matt. xiv. 70).

The completion of Christ's predictions has been fully showed by many writers, particularly by Whitby.⁹ To him I refer the reader (on Matt. xxiv.) ; and shall here insert in the notes some¹

⁹ See also the larger *Commentaries* generally ; Hale's *Analysis of Sacred Chronology*, vol. iii. pp. 560—576 ; Horne's *Introduction*, and Paley, with the other principal writers on the *Evidences of Christianity*. The remarks communicated to Dr. Jortin are by ZACHARIAH PEARCE, D.D., author of a posthumous *Commentary, with Notes, on the Four Evangelists and the Acts of the Apostles ; together with a New Translation of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, with a Paraphrase and Notes*. London, 1777. He was promoted from the deanery of Winchester to the bishoprick of Bangor in 1748, and thence translated to the see of Rochester in 1756. He died, June 29, 1774.—EDIT.

¹ Our Saviour, foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem, applies to the Jews in a prophetic sense this proverbial saying, *Wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together* (Matt. xxiv. 28.). The Jewish writers had this maxim among them, that wicked men while they live are to be reckoned amongst the dead. See Drusius on Matt. iv. 4. and viii. 22. See also Luke xv. 32. Ephes. ii. 1. 1 Tim. i. v. 6. But wicked men are spoken of in Scripture under this figure with still greater propriety, if for their crimes they were devoted to death, and condemned to it by a divine or human sentence. (Gen. xx. 3.) By the word *carcase*, Christ means the Jewish nation, which was morally and judicially dead, and whose destruction was announced in the decrees of heaven. In Euseb. E. H. iii. 23. τέθνηκε is explained by Θεῷ τέθνηκε· ἀπέβη γὰρ πονηρὸς καὶ ἐξώλης καὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον ληστής. Aristoph. Ran. 404. Νυνὶ δὲ δημαγωγεῖ ἐν τοῖς ἄνω νεκροῖς. See L. Capell. and Grotius on Matt. viii. 22, who says, *Neque vocantur homines a vera disciplina, quæ animi vita est, alieni: διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ (ait Clemens Alex. Strom. v.) βαρβάρῳ φιλοσοφίᾳ νεκροὺς καλοῦσι τοὺς ἐκπεσόντας τῶν δογμάτων, καὶ καθυποτάξαντας τὸν νοῦν τοῖς πάθεσι ψυχικοῖς. Hausit quoque hæc, ut alia, ab Orientis philosophia Pythagoras, τὰς τῶν Ἰουδαίων δόξας μιμούμενος, ut de eo scribit Hermippus: siquidem καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους ἀφίκετο, ut de eo ex Diogene scribit Malchus ; unde mos ortus ut his, qui cætu Pythagoreorum essent ejecti, cenotaphia struerentur ; quod Hipparcho cuidam factum legimus.*—Under the metaphor of *eagles*, which fly swiftly and seize upon their prey violently, conquerors with their armies are frequently spoken of in Scripture. Jeremiah (*Lament.* iv. 19.) says, *Our persecutors are swifter than eagles* ; and Hosea (viii. 1.) says of the king of Assyria, *He shall come as an eagle against the house of the Lord, because they have transgressed his covenant*. Ezekiel (xvii. 3.) pronounces a parable under the same figure ; *Thus saith the Lord, A great eagle, with great wings full of feathers, came unto Lebanon, and took the highest branch of the cedar ; which the prophet thus explains (ver. 12) ; Behold the king of Babylon is come to Jerusalem, and hath taken the king thereof*. Nor must it be forgotten, that when Moses (*Deut.* xxviii. 49, &c.) threatens the Jews with the destruction of their nation, if they would not hearken unto the words of the Lord, the description of the calamities, with which he threatens them, answers so exactly in the most material parts to the final destruction of that people by the Romans, that this seems to have been chiefly and principally in the intention of the prophet : and there the destroying army is spoken of under this very emblem of an eagle ; *The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth : a nation whose language thou shalt not understand*. The sense of the proverb then is this :—Wheresoever the wicked Jews are,

remarks on this part of the subject, which Dr. Pearce, the bishop of Bangor, was so kind as to communicate; observing only that Christ foretold,—

there will the Roman eagles, the destroying armies, follow them; and whithersoever they fly, ruin and desolation will overtake them. Christ had been foretelling to his disciples the destruction of the Jewish nation, and the vengeance which he was to take upon them for their obstinate refusal of him and his doctrine. This he expressed by *the coming of the Son of man*; and he told them many particulars of what was to happen before and at that great day of visitation. Among others he acquainted them that there would be some impostors who should set up themselves for the Christ or Messiah of the Jews: *Wherefore*, says he, *if they shall say unto you, Behold he is in the desert, go not forth: behold he is in the secret chambers, believe it not*; i. e. none but false Christs will be found there. The true coming of Christ will be of another nature; *not with observation* (Luke xvii. 20), not with a display of his person, but of his power in the vengeance which he is to take upon the Jews; not restrained to the desert or the chambers, not confined to holes and corners, nor to any one part of Judæa, but extended through every province of it; *for as the lightning*, says he, *cometh out of the east and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be*; i. e. as extensive and universal over the land, as the lightning shines; the comparison being brought in to show not so much its swiftness, as its wide extent and compass: *for wheresoever the carcase &c.* In St. Luke when our Lord had been describing this calamity which was to befall the Jews, his disciples asked him, *Where Lord? where shall this happen?* to which he replied, *Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together.* If then his words contain any direct answer to the question, they must be understood as pointing out the place and extent of the calamity.

This prophecy was pronounced by our Saviour near forty years, and recorded by St. Matthew near thirty years, before the event was to take place. And, for the literal accomplishment of it, we have the authority of Josephus. He was a general on the side of the Jews in the beginning of that war, and a prisoner at large in the Roman army during the rest of it: he was a party concerned in much of the calamity of his countrymen, and an eye-witness to almost all of it. And besides this it is to be considered, that if he ever had heard of this prophecy, which it is probable he had not, yet as he was a Jew by religion, and a Jewish priest too, he is therefore a witness not to be suspected of partiality in this case, and was every way qualified to give us an exact history of those times: which he has accordingly done, by describing very punctually all the particulars of that terrible destruction.

[“Josephus was probably well acquainted with the *Gospels* and the *Epistles of Paul*, especially to the *Romans* and *Hebrews*. He spent two years at *Rome*, about the time *Paul* was a prisoner there, and might have been one of the learned *Jews* with whom *Paul* disputed (Acts xxviii. 22—29). And some remarkable coincidence of expression with the *New Testament* may be detected in his works.”—Hale’s *Anal. of Sacred Chronology*, vol. iii. p. 278, note.—EDIT.]

From his account it may be observed, that the Roman army entered into Judæa on the east side of it, and carried on their conquests westward; as if not only the extensiveness of the ruin, but the very route which the army would take, was intended in the comparison of the lightning coming out of the east and shining even unto the west. In the course of his history he gives us a very particular account

1. The total destruction of the city.

2. Of the Temple.

of the prodigious numbers of such as were slain in Judæa properly so called, in Samaria, the two Galilees, and the region beyond Jordan : and he confirms the prophecy of Christ by making a remarkable observation to this purpose, that *there was not any the least part of Judæa, which did not partake of the calamities of the capital city.* (B. J. v. 3.) There, at Jerusalem, the last and finishing stroke was given to the ruin of the church and state ; for after a long and sharp siege, in which famine killed as many as the sword, in which the judgments of heaven appeared as visibly as the fury of man, in which intestine factions helped on the desolation which the foreign armies completed, Jerusalem was at last taken, not then a city, but a confused mass of ruins, affording a sadder scene of calamity than the world had ever seen, and exactly fulfilling the words of Christ (*Matt. xxiv. 21*) : *Then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world unto this time, no, nor ever shall be.* To which Josephus bears express testimony, and says that *the calamities of all nations from the beginning of the world were exceeded by those which befel his countrymen on this occasion* (B. J. i. 1.).

Christ foretold, that Jerusalem should be *encompassed with armies* (Luke xxi. 20) ; and accordingly it was besieged and taken by the Romans : a circumstance which had no necessary connection with the revolt and conquest of Judæa. For at the time when Christ spake this, the Roman governor resided in that city, and had troops there sufficient to keep it in obedience ; whence it was more probable, that Jerusalem would have continued in a quiet subjection to the Romans, whatever troubles might be raised in other parts of the Jewish dominions.

He foretold, that the Roman ensigns, called *the abomination of desolation* (ver. 15), should be seen *standing in the holy place* or temple ; an event not to be foreseen by human skill, because very unlikely to happen. The great care which the Jews took at other times not to defile that holy place, and the small strength which it had to defend them long from the Roman arms, as they had twice experienced in the memory of man, were both circumstances which, in all human appearance, would have kept them from the rash experiment. And yet, against all probability, they fled to the temple, and there made a last and desperate resistance. Having thus defiled it with their own arms, they made it necessary for the Romans to follow them into the sanctuary ; so that they took it by storm, and of consequence caused their military ensigns to be *seen standing* there.

Christ foretold (*Matt. xxiv. 2*) that when the temple should be taken, *there should not be left there one stone upon another that should not be thrown down.* And yet the building was so magnificent that it was esteemed, for cost, for art, and beauty, one of the wonders of the world ; whence it was natural to expect that the Romans, according to their usual custom amidst their conquests, would endeavour to preserve it safe and entire. And Josephus (B. J. vi. 2, 4) tells us, that Titus laboured with all his power to save it, but that his soldiers, as if moved *δαμονίῳ ὀρμηῇ*, by a *divine impulse*, would not hearken to his positive and repeated orders, but set fire to every part of it, till it was entirely consumed ; and then the ruins were removed, and the soil on which it stood was ploughed up, and not one stone left upon another. See Drusius and Calmet on *Matt. xxiv. 2*, and Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebr.* on the same text, where he quotes for proof of this the *Taanith* of Maimonides, c. 4. Josephus indeed (B. J. vii. 1), speaking of the temple, says only that it was demolished, without

3. The coming of false Christs and false prophets, magicians, and sorcerers, leading the people to the desarts.
4. Famines.
5. Pestilences.
6. Earthquakes.
7. Fearful sights and great signs from heaven.
8. The persecution of the Apostles.
9. The apostacy of some Christians.
10. A preservation of the faithful.
11. The spreading of the Gospel through the Roman world.
12. The Roman standards defiling the holy place.
13. The city encompassed with armies, walls, and trenches.
14. The retiring of the Christians to the mountains.
15. The greatest tribulation that ever was known.
16. The time when these things should happen.

expressly telling us that the foundations of it were digged up. [See note 9, p. 20.—EDIT.] And yet it seems probable that some parts at least of those foundations were digged up, from what he says there in the following chapter concerning one Simon. He lived in Jerusalem, in the upper part of it, near to the temple ; and, when the city was taken, he endeavoured to escape by letting himself down with some of his companions into a cavern ; where, when they had digged but a little way for themselves, he crept out from underground in that very place where the temple had before stood. Therefore, either he crept out in that hollow where the foundation had stood, or, if it was in any other part of the temple, the foundations must have been removed there at least where he worked his way through the ground from the outside to the inside of the temple.

To these circumstances we may add the time. *This generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled* (ver. 34) ; and again (*Matt. xvi. 28*), *There be some standing here, who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom*. Thus Christ pointed out to his hearers, that this train of calamities was not to come upon the Jews immediately, nor yet so late but that some then living should see the accomplishment of his prophecies. The fixing of this circumstance had no connection with anything which might serve for the foundation of human conjecture.

He also foretold, that *the Gospel of his kingdom should be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations* (ver. 14), before this end of the Jewish state should come ; than which no circumstance was less likely, in all human appearance, to happen, if we consider the time when this prophecy was delivered : for we find that within two days afterwards, as himself foretold (*Matt. xxvi. 2 and 31*), *all his disciples forsook him and fled* upon his being apprehended. It could not be expected that they who had deserted his person when alive, would adhere to his cause after his death, and with so much steadiness and courage, as to preach a crucified Jesus in spite of all opposition, through all the nations of the then known earth. And yet this they did with great success, so that St. Paul could say to the Colossians, with truth, that the Gospel was come unto them, as it was in all the world (i. 6).

17. The comparative happiness of the barren women, when a mother killed and ate her own child.

18. Wars and rumours of wars, nation rising against nation, and kingdom against kingdom.

19. The sea and the waves roaring.

20. The dispersion of the captive Jews through all nations.

21. The continuance of the desolation.

22. A shortening of the days of vengeance, for the sake of the elect.

All which things came to pass.

To bring about this great event, and to certify posterity of its truth, God raised up an illustrious and worthy Prince to accomplish it, and an illustrious historian to record it: to record the things of which he was an eye-witness, and in which he had borne a considerable share.

Vespasian was lifted up from obscurity to the empire: he was strangely spared, and promoted, and employed by Nero, who hated him. If he had not put an end to the civil wars, and to the great calamities of the empire, Jerusalem would not have been destroyed at the time foretold by Christ. *Lucem caliganti reddidit mundo*, says Q. Curtius, speaking most probably of Vespasian.²

2. *On the Writings of Josephus.*—Josephus assured Vespasian that he and his son Titus should be emperors, after Nero and some others, who should reign only a short time.³ When Josephus made this declaration there was no appearance of such an event. He says that he had received the knowledge of these things in a dream, which was accounted by the Jews to be a lower degree of prophecy, and to have been sometimes granted to them, after the prophetic *afflatus* had ceased at the death of Malachi. Josephus says that Hyrcanus had been favoured with such kind of revelations.⁴ He records a prophetic dream of his own.⁵ He mentions also strange deliverances vouchsafed to himself from seemingly unavoidable destruction.⁶ He had taken shelter in a cave with forty des-

² Q. Curt. x. 9.

³ B. J. iii. 8. Sueton. Vesp. 5. *Unus ex nobilibus captivis Josephus, cum conjiceretur in vincula, constantissime asseveravit fore ut ab eodem brevi solveretur, verum jam imperatore.*

⁴ Ant. xiii. 12. Bell. Jud. i. 2.

⁵ In his *Life*, § 42.

⁶ B. J. iii. 8.

perate persons, who were determined to perish rather than to yield, and who proposed to pay him the compliment of killing him first, as the most honourable man in the company. When he could not divert them from their frantic resolution of dying, he had no other refuge than to engage them to draw lots who should be killed, the one after the other, and at last only he and another remained, whom he persuaded to surrender to the Romans. I would not willingly be imposed upon, or impose upon the reader; but I leave it to be considered whether in all this there might not be something extraordinary, as both Vespasian and Josephus were designed and reserved for extraordinary purposes, to assist in fulfilling and justifying the prophecies of Daniel and of our Lord.⁷ The same Providence which raised up and conducted Cyrus, and preserved the ^arash Macedonian conqueror from perishing, till he had overthrown the Persian empire, that the prophecies might be accomplished, might take the *Roman emperor* and the *Jewish writer* under a singular protection, for reasons of no less importance. The historian was on all accounts a proper person to deliver these things to posterity, and one to whom the Pagans, the Jews, and the Christians could have no reasonable objection. He was of a noble family; he had enjoyed the advantage of a good education; he had acted in the war as a general; he had much learning, singular abilities, a fair character, and a great love for his own country. The service which he has done to Christianity was on his side plainly undesigned: he never gives even the remotest hint that the Jews suffered for rejecting the Messiah. His book had the ^aapprobation of Vespasian and Titus, Herod and Agrippa, and of several persons of distinction, and he wanted not adversaries who would have exposed him, if he had advanced untruths; so that, though in some other points he might have been capable of deceiving and of being deceived, yet as to the transactions of his own times, he must

⁷ Without any further consideration than that of the ordinary means which God employs to raise up fitting instruments for the furtherance of his divine counsels, our author's hypothesis may fairly be admitted. On the subject of *dreams*, see below, under the Remarks on *Prophecy in General*.—EDIT.

⁸ I call him rash, because he exposed his own person too much; for his enterprise, though very bold, was perhaps neither rash, nor rashly conducted.

⁹ Contr. Apion. i. 9.

pass, in general, for a candid, impartial, accurate writer, and has passed for such in the opinion of the most competent judges. But though we are indebted to him for several particulars, which surprisingly agree with the predictions of Christ, yet the destruction of the Jewish state rests not upon his single authority, but upon ancient history and general consent, and is a fact which never was questioned.¹

What Josephus says concerning the outrageous wickedness and strange infatuation of many of the Jews,² must be true; the facts related by him sufficiently show it: but the reason for which he dwelt so much on a subject so disagreeable to one who loved his nation, seems to have been this; he knew not how to account otherwise for God's giving up his own people to such calamities, and seeming to fight against them himself; and he was afraid of consequences which Pagans and Christians would draw from it against the Jewish religion. Cicero, because it served his purpose, had inferred from the calamities which in his days befel the Jews, that they were a nation not acceptable to the Deity. *Stantibus Hierosolymis, pacatisque Judæis, tamen istorum religio sacrorum a splendore hujus imperii, gravitate nominis nostri, majorum institutis, abhorrebat: nunc vero hoc*

¹ The following are the terms in which Josephus speaks of the destruction of the city of Jerusalem (*B. J.* vii. 1. 1.) :—κελεύει Καῖσαρ ἤδη τὴν πόλιν ἀπάσαν καὶ τὸν νέων κατασκάπτειν.—τὸν δὲ ἄλλον ἅπαντα τῆς πόλεως περίβολον οὕτως ἐξωμάλισαν οἱ κατασκάπτοντες, ὥς μηδὲ πώποτ' οἰκηθῆναι πίστιν ἂν ἔτι παραχεῖν τοῖς προσελθοῦσι. Τοῦτο μὲν οὖν τέλος ἐκ τῆς τῶν νεωτερισάντων ἀνοίας Ἱεροσολυμοῖς ἐγένετο, λαμπρὰ τε πόλει καὶ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις διαβοηθείσῃ. He also mentions the remark of Eleazar, respecting the Temple, that πρόβριζος ἐκ βάθρων ἀνήρπασται. See also *B. J.* vi. 4, 5, 7. It should seem then that his testimony to these facts is sufficiently precise. With respect to collateral testimony, Marmonides, referred to in the remarks of Bishop Pearce, relates that Terentius Rufus, an officer of Titus, tore up the foundations of the Temple with a ploughshare; and Eusebius (*Dem. Ev.* vi. 13), adverting to the prophecy of Micah (*iii.* 12.) that *Zion should be ploughed as a field*, affirms that he himself had seen the Romans ploughing with oxen on Mount Sion. Jortin adverts to the passage in the sequel. Abundant references to heathen authorities will be found in the Commentators.—EDIT.

² Joseph. *B. J.* v. 10. *It were impossible to recount at large all their iniquity; but, to be brief, never did any other city endure such calamities, and never was there a generation more productive of wickedness since the creation of the world. Again; I think that if the Romans had delayed their assault upon these sinners, their city would either have been swallowed up by an earthquake, or overwhelmed by a deluge, or destroyed by the thunderbolt of Sodom; for it produced a generation far more godless—γενεάν πολὺ ἄθεωτέραν—than those who so suffered.* See also *B. J.* iv. 9. vi. 9. vii. 8. *Ant.* xx. 8.—EDIT.

*magis, quod illa gens, quid de imperio nostro sentiret, ostendit armis: quam cara diis immortalibus esset, docuit, quod est victa, quod elocata, quod servata.*³

In his *Antiquities*, Josephus takes too great liberties with sacred history, and accommodates it too much to the taste of the Gentiles, which yet probably he did to recommend his oppressed and unhappy nation to the favour of the Greeks and Romans. There are few of his suppressions, or alterations, or embellishments, for which a prudential reason might not be assigned.⁴ In his *History* he shows an instance of his art, in complimenting Titus without saying an untruth. He relates that Titus engaged with the Jews, who had made a sally and fought desperately; and that Titus himself slew twelve of their bravest men, who headed the rest. He says not *how* he slew them; but Suetonius tells us that Titus, at the siege of Jerusalem, shot twelve of the foremost of the enemies with so many arrows. The circumstances give great reason to suppose that both relate the same story.⁵

The history of the Jewish war by Josephus seems to be a commentary upon the prophecies of Christ. Josephus, amongst other particulars, gives a distinct account of the *fearful sights and great signs from heaven*, which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem, and Tacitus has confirmed the narration of Josephus.⁶

³ *Pro Flacco*, 28. Some would read *serva*. Dr. Thirlby conjectured *servit*: and I find it so cited by Hammond in his notes on Revel. xiii. 5.

[An legendum *deserta, vastata, vel perdit*!—EDIT.]

⁴ May it not have been this time-serving policy, which suggested the flattery which he addressed to Vespasian, as before related (p. 18); and even induced him, in spite of his accurate knowledge of the Scriptures, to represent his patron, though an heathen and a stranger, as the promised Messiah? And yet Scaliger calls him *diligentissimus καὶ φιλαληθέστατος omnium Scriptorum; de quo nos hoc audacter dicimus, non solum in rebus Judaicis, sed etiam in externis, tutius illi credi quam omnibus Græcis et Latinis*. Proleg. pp. 16, 17. Nor is this eulogium, under certain limitations, undeserved.—EDIT.

⁵ B. J. v. 6. 6. Καὶ δώδεκα μὲν αὐτὸς τῶν προμάχων ἀναίρει. Sueton. *Tit.* 5. *Novissima Hierosolymorum oppugnatione, duodecim propugnatores totidem sagittarum confecit ictibus*.

⁶ The account of Josephus will be found in B. J. vi. 5. 3, 4. That of Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 47; *Hist.* v. 13.) is more concise, and may therefore be here inserted. *Fine anni vulgantur prodigia, imminentium malorum nuntia. Visæ per cælum concurrere acies, rutilantia arma, et subito nubium igne collucere templum. Expasæ repente delubri fores; et audita major humanâ vox, "Excedere deos:" simul ingens motus excedentium*.—EDIT.

If Christ had not expressly foretold this, many, who give little heed to portents, and who know that historians have been too credulous in that point, would have suspected that Josephus exaggerated, and that Tacitus was misinformed; but as the testimonies of Josephus and Tacitus confirm the predictions of Christ, so the predictions of Christ confirm the wonders recorded by these historians.

3. *Books of N. T. authentic, and extant before the Fall of Jerusalem.*—Let us proceed to show that the predictions of Christ were extant before the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70): for this is the important point.

The books and epistles of the New Testament were written by disciples of Christ, or their companions.

A. *Internal Evidence.*—We cannot suppose that any persons, of whatsoever abilities, could have forged them after the decease of the Apostles; for these writings contain various and numerous incidents of time, place, persons, names, and things; occasional discourses, differences of style, epistles in answer to epistles, and passages cited from those which they answer; directions and observations suited to the state of several churches; seeming contradictions, and real difficulties which might have easily been avoided; things mentioned which worldly considerations would have suppressed, and things omitted which invention and imagination might have supplied; a character of Christ, arising from his words and actions, of a most singular kind, left to its intrinsic merit, and aided by no art;⁷ and in the writings of St. Paul, sentiments warm, pathetic, and coming from the heart; particularities in each Gospel suitable to the character, knowledge, situation and circumstances of each Evangelist; &c. &c.

The forgers of these things, if they were such, must have equalled 'Father Hardouin's atheistical monks of the thir-

⁷ Disc. vi. on the Christ. Rel.

[On the evidences, internal and external, of the authenticity and genuineness of the New Testament, the works of *Lardner* and *Paley* will afford ample information to those who wish to pursue the subject at large.—EDIT.]

⁸ This part of the subject is beautifully treated by *Paley*.—EDIT.

⁹ Hardouin's craziness consisted in rejecting what all the world received; the opposite folly to which is the receiving what all the world rejects.

[*John Hardouin* was a French Jesuit of considerable learning, to whom we are

teenth century, who, according to his fantastical account, in an age of ignorance and barbarity, surpassed in abilities all the ancients and moderns; forged the Latin and Greek authors, whom we call classical, and were not only great poets, orators, grammarians, linguists, and knaves, but great mathematicians, chronologers, astronomers, geographers, and critics; and capable of inserting, in their proper places, names and accounts of men, rivers, cities, and regions, eclipses of the sun and moon, Athenian Archons, Attic months, Roman Consuls, and Olympiads: all which happy inventions have been since confirmed by astronomical calculations and tables, voyages, inscriptions, *Fasti Capitolini*, fragments, manuscripts, and a diligent comparing of authors with each other.

There is not one page in the New Testament, which affords not internal characters of being composed by men who lived at the time when the things happened which are there related. This is as evident, as it is that the noble English historian,¹ who wrote an account of the troubles in the time of Charles the First, was himself concerned in those transactions. The discourses of Christ, as I have observed elsewhere, are always occasional, and full of allusions to particular incidents. The historical parts of the New Testament, and the travels of Christ and of his Apostles, correspond with the accounts and descriptions which may be collected from other authors. In the judgment which ²Pilate passed upon Christ, the rules of the

indebted for an edition of *PLINY'S HISTORIA NATURALIS (ad usum Delphini; Paris, 1685)*, which, notwithstanding the glaring absurdities of the system advocated by the editor, is much and deservedly esteemed for the deep erudition displayed in the notes. He was author also of a "Commentary on the New Testament," of a work "On the Use of Medals in Chronology," an edition of "Themistius," and sundry minor works. His favourite theory regarded all the writings of classical antiquity as forgeries, with the exception of that of his admired Pliny, the works of Cicero, the *Satires* and *Epistles* of Horace, and the *Georgics* of Virgil; the *Æneid*, and the *Odes* of Horace he attributed to a Benedictine of the thirteenth century. *Hardouin* died in 1729, in the eighty-third year of his age.—EDIT.]

¹ Lord CLARENDON; in his *History of the Rebellion*.—EDIT.

² M. Huber remarque fort bien, qu'il paroît, par toutes les circonstances du jugement de Pilate, que toutes les règles du Droit Romain y furent exactement observées; et que cela peut nous convaincre de la vérité de cette histoire. Des gens du petit peuple parmi les Juifs, tels qu'étoient les Évangélistes, ne pouvoient pas être si bien instruits de cela; et s'ils ne l'avoient apprise de témoins oculaires, ils n'auroient jamais pu la raconter, comme ils ont fait, sans dire quelque chose

Roman Law were observed. What is accidentally mentioned concerning the behaviour of Felix and Gallio, and some others, agrees with the character which Roman writers have given of them. There are endless peculiarities of this kind which might be produced. A man of very ordinary abilities, who relates various things of which he has been an ear and an eye-witness, is under no difficulty or pain: but a forger, if he had the abilities of an angel, whose imagination must supply him with materials, can never write in such a manner; and if he has tolerable sense, he will avoid entering into such a minute detail, in which he must perpetually expose his ignorance and his dishonesty.

Christ began to preach when he was ^aabout thirty years of age, and the 'Jews from his countenance judged him to be more advanced in life. He chose Apostles, some of whom were married,^b one was employed in a public office,^c and most were probably as old as himself, if not older. If they had not been cut off by martyrdom, yet few of them, in the course of nature, would have survived the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70), which was about seventy-four years after the birth of Christ. Ecclesiastical history assures us that St. Peter and St. Paul died before that time; and Christ had told Peter that he should be put to death in his old age.^d

History also informs us that St. John lived long after the

qui se trouveroit contraire à l'usage des Gouverneurs dans les provinces Romaines. *Le Clerc*, Bibl. anc. et mod. t. xiii. p. 100. See also *Huber's Dissertation*.

^a Luke iii. 23.

^b John viii. 57. [Jortin is supported in the inference which he deduces from this text by *Whitby*, *Grotius*, *Lampe*, and others. Irenæus, and others of the Fathers, argued from it that our Lord must have been, at the time, between forty and fifty years of age. It is more probable that the Jews employed a *round number*; making an apparent concession, with a view to strengthen the inference they intended to deduce.—EDIT.]

^c There is no positive evidence in the New Testament, that any of the Apostles were married, except St. Peter (Matt. viii. 14); though it seems highly probable from 1 Cor. ix. 5, that such was the case. The interpolated epistle of Ignatius to the Philippians (c. 4), speaks of Peter, Paul, and other Apostles as married men: and St. Ambrose (on 1 Cor. xi.) says, *Omnes Apostoli, exceptis Johanne et Paulo, uxores habuisse dicuntur*. We may remark, by the way, that the single instance of St. Peter is sufficient proof that the Church of Rome has no authority for imposing celibacy on the clergy.—EDIT.

^d Matthew, the Publican.—EDIT.

^e John xxi. 18.

destruction of Jerusalem;⁸ and Christ had given an intimation that he should see that event, for he said once to his disciples, *There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.*⁹ Afterwards, when Peter was desirous to know what should befall John, Christ replied, *If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?*¹

St. John had seen the three gospels, for he wrote his own as a supplement to them, which appears plainly in the Harmony of the Evangelists.² He omits these predictions of Christ, though he was present at that discourse; of which omission the most probable reason is, that the other three had mentioned them.

Matthew, Mark, and Luke relate that when the Jews came to seize Christ, a disciple drew his sword, and wounded one of them. John alone names him, and says that it was Simon Peter. The cause of their silence is obvious: Peter was living when they wrote, and they suppressed his name for several reasons; but, when John wrote, Peter was dead.

The three first Evangelists make no mention of the resurrection of Lazarus, perhaps lest the Jews, who had consulted to put him to death, should assassinate him. When St. John wrote, it is probable that he was dead, and therefore he gave a particular account of that resurrection.

There is reason to think that St. John also might compose a part at least of his Gospel a little before the destruction of Jerusalem, since he ³speaks of the porches of Bethesda as standing; though this amounts not to a full and conclusive proof, and may be a small inaccuracy of style; or, it may be, those porches remained undemolished.

St. Luke ends his history of the Apostles with St. Paul's dwelling at Rome for two years, A. D. 65.⁴ He mentions nothing

⁸ Chrysostom (Serm. de S. Joan. Ap.) affirms that John lived to the age of 120 years; but according to the opinion which is generally received, he returned from Patmos after the death of Domitian, about A. D. 96, and died at Ephesus, in the commencement of the reign of Trajan, A. D. 100.—EDIT.

⁹ Matt. xvi. 28. ¹ John xxi. 22. ² See also Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iii. 24.—EDIT.

³ John v. 2, "Ἔστι δὲ—κολυμβήθρα.—Ἦν δὲ, which is in some few copies, is probably the emendation of a critic. [See Lardner on this point.—EDIT.]

⁴ The date of A. D. 65 is certainly incorrect. Mr. Greswell places the date of St. Paul's liberation in the year 61, and that of the Acts in 60; others place the

farther, and therefore probably wrote the Acts before the death of that apostle; and he refers us to his own gospel, as to a book which he had published before.

Ecclesiastical⁵ history informs us that Mark's Gospel had the approbation of Peter, and that Mark was instructed by him, which opinion seems somewhat favoured by the narration of Peter's fall and repentance. Matthew and Luke say that he *wept bitterly*; Mark says only, *he wept*; but represents his crime in stronger terms than Luke. Matthew relates at large the commendation and the commission which Christ gave to Peter: *Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven* (xvi. 17.) Mark omits it (viii. 29).

St. Peter, who died before A.D. 70, mentioned the approaching ruin of Jerusalem, in the Acts of the Apostles,⁶ and in his own Epistles,⁷ as the best commentators agree; and so does St. James,⁸ and St. Paul,⁹ and the 'author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

B. *External Evidence.*—*Papias* conversed with the disciples of the apostles about the beginning of the second century. He² speaks of the gospels of Matthew and Mark as extant, and written by them.

Justin Martyr (A. D. 140.) mentions the Gospels as universally received, and read in the congregations, in his time. He must have conversed with Christians who were old men, and from them have learned that the Gospels were extant when they were young. Οἱ Ἀπόστολοι (says he) ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ'

former event in 62. At the same time, our author's argument is not affected by the difference.—EDIT.

⁵ Euseb. E. H. ii. 15. ⁶ Acts ii. 19. ⁷ 1 Peter iv. 7. ⁸ James v. 1.

⁹ Phil. iv. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 16; 1 Thess. v. 2. The same event is also, perhaps, alluded to 2 Thess. i. 6, &c., and 2 Thess. ii. 2, &c.

¹ Heb. x. 36. [Respecting the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, see Stuart on the Epistle, and Horne's *Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures*.—EDIT.]

² Ap. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. iii. 39, *sub finem*.

αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται Εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν.—
And again; Τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἀναγινώσκεται.³
His citations from the four Gospels, from the Epistles of St. Paul, and from the Revelation, show to a demonstration that he had them as we now have them, in the main.⁴

In the interval between A. D. 70 and Justin are the authors called Apostolical, *Barnabas*, *Clemens*, *Hermas*, *Ignatius*, and *Polycarp*.⁵ These authors make use of some of the Gospels and Epistles, and allude to them; which makes them highly valuable, and serviceable to the Christian cause. We cannot suppose that they had the inclination, we may positively affirm that they had not the capacity, to forge them. Their own writings prove it.

Barnabas, in his *Epistle*, makes use of *Matthew*, *Luke*, *John*, and the *Epistle to the Romans*.

Clemens, in his *first Epistle*, makes mention of St. Paul's *Epistle to the Corinthians*, and takes passages from *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, *Acts*, *Romans*, 1 and 2 *Cor.*, *Philip.*, 1 *Thess.*, *Ephes.*, 1 and 2 of *Peter*, 1 *Tim.*, 1 and 3 of *John*, *Revel.*, and particularly from the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. He also speaks of the Martyrdom of Peter and Paul. In his *second Epistle*, if it be his, there are passages from *Matthew*, *Luke*, 1 *Cor.*, and *Hebr.*

Hermas says, I. 2. *Juravit Dominus per Filium suum, Qui denegaverit filium et se—et ipsi denegaturi sunt illum*: from *Mat.* x. 33.—I. 6. *Cum ergo venerit tribulatio, propter divitias suas et negotiationes, abnegant Dominum*: from *Mat.* xiii. 21.—I. 9. *Videte ergo vos qui gloriamini in divitiis, ne forte ingemiscant ii qui egent, et gemitus eorum ascendat ad Dominum*: from *James* v. 4.—*Qui amatis primos consessus*: from *Mat.* xxiii. 6.—*Melius erat illis non nasci*: from *Mat.* xxvi. 24.—Mand. II. 5. *Spiritus sanctus, qui in te est, angustiabitur*: from *Ephes.* iv. 30.—*Si resistis Diabolo, fugiet a te*: from *James* iv. 7.—II. 6. Φοβήθητι τὸν Κύριον τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι: from *James* iv. 12. Such references should have been marked in the editions of the *Apostolical Fathers*.

In the *Apostolical Constitutions* also, and in the *Recognitions* and the *Homilies of Pseudo-Clemens*, there are many passages

³ Apol. 1, cc. 66, 67.

⁴ On this point, see Bishop Kaye's Justin, c. 8.—EDIT.

⁵ Remarks on all these writers will be found in their proper order.—EDIT.

taken from the New Testament; but as these books are not so ancient as they pretend to be, I pass them by for the present, and shall pay my respects to them in another place. The numerous and large citations from the LXX, and the New Testament, in the *Constitutions*, are however so far useful, that they help to show how those places stood in the copies of the fourth century, and perhaps somewhat earlier.

Ignatius, who in his old age suffered under Trajan, about A. D. 107,⁶ and who was contemporary with the Apostles, in his *genuine* Epistles alludes to the Gospels of *Matthew*, of *Luke*, and of *John*; *Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians*, those to the *Colossians*, *Galatians*, *Philippians*, and *Ephesians*; the *first Epistle of Peter*, &c. Besides the places which are referred to in the margin of the *Patres Apostolici*, I have observed several, upon a cursory perusal, to which, I am sensible, more might be added. *Ignatius ad Ephes.* c. 1. μιμηταὶ ὄντες Θεοῦ, from *Ephes.* v. 1.—ἐν αἵματι Θεοῦ, perhaps from *Acts* xx. 28.—τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτὸν ἀνενεγκόντος Θεῷ προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν, from *Ephes.* v. 2.—C. 2. ὀναίμην ὑμῶν, from *Philem.* 20.—C. 4. μέλη ὄντας τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, from *Ephes.* v. 30.—C. 5. εἰ γὰρ ἐνὸς καὶ δευτέρου προσευχὴ τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ἔχει, perhaps from *James* v. 16. or *Mat.* xviii. 19, 20.—C. 9. λίθοι ναοῦ Πατρὸς—εἰς οἰκοδομὴν, from *Ephes.* ii. 20.—C. 13. τέλος δὲ ἀγάπη, from 1 *Tim.* i. 5.—C. 14. ἄμεινόν ἐστι σιωπᾶν καὶ εἶναι, ἢ λαλοῦντα μὴ εἶναι· καλὸν τὸ διδάσκειν, ἐὰν ὁ λέγων ποιῇ. from *Mat.* v. 19. vii. 21.—C. 15. οὐδὲν λανθάνει τὸν Κύριον, perhaps from *Heb.* iv. 12, 13. or *Revel.* ii. 23, or from other places.—C. 17. τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, from *John* xiv. 30. and *Ephes.* ii. 2.—μὴ αἰχμαλωτίσῃ ὑμᾶς, from *Rom.* vii. 23.—C. 19. μυστήρια—πῶς οὐ ἐφανερώθη, from 1 *Tim.* iii. 16.—C. 20. ἓνα ἄρτον κλῶντες, from 1 *Cor.* x. 17.—C. 21. ἔσχατος ὢν τῶν ἐκεῖ πιστῶν, from 1 *Cor.* xv. 9, or *Mat.* xx. 26, 27.—In c. 12. *Ignatius* takes notice of *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, and of his martyrdom: and as he was writing to the same Church, he often alludes, as you see, to the Apostle's letter.

Ad Magnes. c. i. ἀγάπης, ἧς οὐδὲν προκέκριται, from 1 *Cor.* xiii. 13.—C. 3. νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, perhaps from 1 *Tim.* iv. 12.—C. 5. εἰς τὸν ἴδιον τόπον, from *Acts* i. 25.—ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα, perhaps from

⁶ For the settlement of this date, see the remarks on the *Martyrdom of Ignatius*.—EDIT.

Rev. xiii. 17.—C. 7. εἰς νοῦς, μία ἐλπίς, from *Ephes.* iv. 3, § 99.—C. 8. εἰ κατὰ νόμον ζῶμεν, ὁμολογοῦμεν χάριν μὴ εἰληφέναι, from *Galat.* v. 4.—C. 10. ὑπέρθεσθε τὴν κακὴν ζύμην τὴν παλαιωθεῖσαν, from *1 Cor.* v. 7.—C. 13. κατενοδωθῆτε, from εὐδοῦσθαι, a verb used in the New Testament.—*Ad. Trall.* c. 7. μὴ φνισιουμένοις, a word often used by St. Paul.—C. 8. μηδεὶς [τὶ] κατὰ τοῦ πλησίου ἐχέτω, from *Mat.* v. 23.—C. 10. ὥσπερ τινὲς λέγουσι, ἐγὼ τί δέδεμαι; τί εὐχομαι θηριομαχῆσαι; from *1 Cor.* xv. 15, 32.—C. 11. οὐκ εἰσὶν φυτεία Πατρός, from *Mat.* xv. 13.—C. 12. ἵνα μὴ ἀδόκιμος εὗρεθῶ, from *1 Cor.* ix. 27.—*Ad Roman.* c. 2. τοῦ σπονδισθῆναι Θεῷ, from *2 Tim.* iv. 6.—C. 3. τὰ γὰρ φαινόμενα πρόσκαιρα. τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπόμενα αἰώνια, from *2 Cor.* iv. 18.—C. 6. τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται, κ. τ. λ., from *Mat.* xvi. 26. (But perhaps this is an interpolation. It is not in the old version.)—C. 7. ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται—ὑδὼρ δὲ ζῶν, καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοὶ, from *Galat.* vi. 14; *John* iv. 14.—C. 9. ἔκτρωμα, from *1 Cor.* xv. 8.—*Ad Philadelph.* c. 6. ὅτι ἐβάρησά τινα, from *2 Cor.* xii. 16.—C. 9. αὐτὸς ὢν θύρα, from *John* x. 7.—C. 10. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γενομένοις, from *1 Cor.* xi. 20.—*Ad Smyrn.* c. 3. συνέφαγεν καὶ συνέπιεν, from *Acts* x. 41.—C. 4. μὴ παραδέχεσθαι, from *2 John*, 10.—C. 10. τὰ δεσμά μου οὐκ ἐπαισχύνθητε,—Read ἐπησχύνθητε,—from *2 Tim.* i. 16.—οὐδὲ ὑμᾶς ἐπαισχυνθήσεται Χριστός, from *Mark* viii. 38, or *Luke* ix. 26.

The *Epistle to Polycarp*, which is the last, is also inferior to the rest: there is some reason to suspect that it is not genuine.⁷

Ad Philadelph. c. 5. προσφυγων τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὡς σαρκὶ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ τοῖς αποστόλοις ὡς πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐκκλησίας. *Quæ verba videntur de Evangeliiis et Apostolicis scriptis intelligenda; ita ut hoc*

⁷ This is the opinion of *Archbishop Usher*; though he strongly advocates the genuineness of the other six of the shorter Epistles. See Note at p. 33. *Vossius*, also, acknowledges a peculiarity of style which is calculated to excite suspicion. The use of the plural number, however, in some parts of the letter, is evidently designed to distinguish between the advice which he tenders immediately to Polycarp, and that which he recommends the bishop to address to his flock. This will readily appear from the opening of the 5th chapter. Now Polycarp himself distinctly mentions a letter which he received from Ignatius (*Ad Phil.* c. 13); and Eusebius (*H. E.* iii. 36), in common with the Epistle to the Church of Smyrna, speaks also of another, which was written ἰδίως τῷ ταύτης προηγουμένῳ Πολυκάρπῳ. Since then the ancient Fathers ascribe this Epistle to Ignatius, as well as the rest, their evidence, if deemed satisfactory in the one case, must also be admitted in the other.—EDIT.

*velit Ignatius, cognoscendæ divinæ voluntatis causâ, se confugere ad Evangelia, quibus crederet non secus ac si Christus ipse in carne, hoc est, in eo statu quo fuit in terris, conspicuus et etiamnum apud homines vivens, eos sermones, qui in Evangeliiis leguntur, ore suo proferret; tum etiam ad scripta Apostolorum, quos habebat quasi totius Christianæ Ecclesiæ Presbyterium sub Christo omnium Episcopo, quod cætus Christianos omnes, quid credendum sit, doceret. Unde quanti fierent Libri sacri Novi Testamenti hisce temporibus, satis liquit. Addit, Sed et Prophetas amamus, quia ipsi nunciarunt quæ pertinent ad Evangelium: id sperarunt atque expectarunt. Quæ respiciunt Vetus Testamentum, prout scriptum exstat, nam aliunde Prophetæ Ignatio innotescere non potuerant. Nec leviter prætermittendum, ab eo primo quidem loco Novi Testamenti scripta, per quæ Christiani sumus, memorari, quasi perfugium suum; secundo verò Veteris Libros, quia ex iis Novum confirmari potest.**

In the same Epistle (c. 8.), Ignatius introduces a Jew, saying, *ἐὰν μὴ ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἔνρῳ, ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ οὐ πιστεύω.* Where see Le Clerc.—*Ad Smyrn.* c. 5. *οὐς οὐκ ἔπεισαν αἱ προφητεῖαι, οὐδ' ὁ νόμος Μωσέως, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μεχρὶ νῦν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.* He speaks of heretics, who denied that Christ had a body, and that he really suffered. How were such people to be converted or confuted? By the testimony of the Apostles, recorded in the New Testament; of men, who, as Ignatius says, did eat and drink with the Lord, both before and after his resurrection: consequently *Εὐαγγέλιον* in this place means the *Gospels*, the books of the New Testament.—So again, c. 7. *προσέχειν δὲ τοῖς προφήταις, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, ἐν ᾧ τὸ πάθος ἡμῶν δεδήλωται, καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τετελείωται.*

C. *Digression on the genuineness of the Epistles of Ignatius.*—Thus the *shorter Epistles* of Ignatius allude to the writings of the Apostles; but in the *larger Epistles*, which are generally supposed to be *interpolated*, the passages of the Old and New Testament are more numerous, and cited more accurately and directly; and sometimes impertinently, as in the *Constitutions*; and introduced with, *Thus saith our Lord, Thus says Paul, and Peter, and Luke, and, Thus say the Scriptures.* The Apostolical

* Clericus, *Hist. Eccl.* p. 567.

Fathers rather allude than cite; and therefore the hand of the forger discovers itself in these *larger Epistles*.

Ignatius wrote his Letters when he was condemned, and chained, and guarded, and conducted by soldiers, who were mere brutes, and used him ill; οἱ καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι χείρους γίνονται, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀδικήμασιν αὐτῶν μᾶλλον μαθητένομαι.⁹ We may justly suppose, and the word εὐεργητούμενοι implies it, that the Christians who attended this most venerable Bishop and Martyr, and resorted to him on his journey to Rome, gave money to his guards, that they might be permitted to converse with him, and to minister to him, and that he might have leave to write and send his Letters: and this small indulgence was granted by those ruffians with an ill grace, and in an insolent manner. Therefore it is more probable that the *shorter Epistles* should be genuine than the *larger*, with their pomp and parade of passages from the Old and New Testament, which *secessum scribentis et otia quærunt*.

In the *interpolated Epistle* of Ignatius *ad Ephes.* c. 5. λέγει δὲ καὶ ὁ Κύριος πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς, Ὁ ὑμῶν ἀκούων, ἐμοῦ ἀκούει. *The Lord says to the Priests, He that heareth you, heareth me.* From *Luke* x. 16. A very suspicious phrase:—why does this writer call the disciples *Priests*?

In c. 12. ἐγὼ ἐλάχιστος Ἰγνάτιος, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἀβελ τοῦ δικαίου ἕως τοῦ αἵματος Ἰγνατίου ἐλάχιστος. In this application of Scripture there is a vanity, under a feigned modesty, which ill suits with this humble and pious Martyr, who as yet had not shed his blood.

Ad Magnes. c. 3. Δανιὴλ μὲν γὰρ ὁ σοφὸς, δωδεκαετῆς, γέγονε κάτοχος τῷ θεῷ πνεύματι. A childish romance; and what follows is no better.

Ad Philad. c. 4. οἱ ἄρχοντες πειθαρχεῖτωσαν τῷ Καίσαρι, οἱ στρατιῶται τοῖς ἄρχουσιν. This smells of interpolation. Ignatius addresses himself, not to Pagans, but to Christians; and it may be questioned whether in his time there were Christian officers and soldiers in the Roman army.¹

⁹ *Ad Rom.* c. 5.

¹ See Moyle's Letters concerning the *Thundering Legion*; whose arguments in behalf of the negative are very strong.

Ad Smyrn. c. 5, speaking of heretics, he says, τὰ δὲ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν, ὄντα ἄπιστα, νῦν οὐκ ἔδοξέ μοι ἐγγράψαι· μηδὲ γένοιτό με αὐτῶν μνημονεύειν, μέχρις οὗ μετανοήσωσιν. And accordingly, the genuine Ignatius mentions not, I think, the name of any heretic. But how doth this agree with the catalogue of heretics in the *interpolated* Epistle *ad Trallianos*, where he names Simon, Menander, Basilides, the Nicolaïtæ, Theodotus, Cleobulus? The Interpolator seems to have been aware of it, and therefore he has slyly inserted a νῦν. Νῦν οὐκ ἔδοξε, *at this time I will not name them.* In the *shorter* Epistle we have οὐκ ἔδοξε without the νῦν. Observe that the *nunc* is not in the Latin translation joined to the interpolated Epistles, but is omitted or dropped by some accident; for it is in the ancient Latin version of the interpolated Epistles,—*non est mihi nunc visum scribere.*

C. 9. Τίμα, (φησὶν,) νιέ, τὸν Θεὸν καὶ βασιλέα. Ἐγὼ δέ φημι, Τίμα μὲν τὸν Θεόν, ὡς αἴτιον τῶν ὅλων καὶ κύριον· ἐπίσκοπον δὲ, ὡς ἀρχιερέα, Θεοῦ εἰκόνα φοροῦντα· κατὰ μὲν τὸ ἄρχειν, Θεοῦ, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἱερατεύειν, Χριστοῦ· καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον, τιμᾶν χρὴ καὶ βασιλέα. *My Son, says Solomon, honour God and the King. But I say unto you, honour God, as the Author and the Lord of all, and the Bishop, as the high-priest, who bears the image of God; of God, as he is a Ruler, and of Christ, as he is a priest. And after him, honour the King also.* The author of this commandment, in all probability, was a Bishop, but not such a Bishop as Ignatius. *The Scripture says—But I say—I who am wiser and greater than Solomon.* A very modest speech truly, and much in character, and becoming the meek Ignatius! Here the Bishop is equalled, or rather, is preferred to Jesus Christ; for Christ is not supposed to be ἀρχων, a Ruler, though he be *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.* After this homage is paid to the Bishop, leave is given to the Christians to honour Cæsar. How condescending and gracious, and how well contrived to make the Roman Emperors very fond of their Christian subjects! But this is altogether in the style of the *Apostolical Constitutions.*

Again, he says to those who had showed him kindness, ὁ τιμῶν δέσμιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μαρτύρων λήψεται μισθόν. Ignatius would not have spoken thus of himself.

There are in these Epistles a multitude of places which agree

with the *Constitutions*; the one certainly transcribes the other; and both are of the same stamp, *ejusdem farinae*.²

² The reader is desired to observe, that these *larger* epistles have been examined, and condemned as *interpolated*, by Usher, Pearson, Hammond, Cotelierius, Is. Vossius, Le Clerc, and many others, to whose objections and arguments I have endeavoured here to add a few more, and shall add something further when I come to speak of Ignatius.

[There is no instance, perhaps, in the annals of patristical theology, of greater diversity of opinion and warmer polemical discussion, than in the settlement of the long-disputed question of the genuineness of the writings of Ignatius. The controversy mainly originated with the opponents of episcopacy, in the latter part of the sixteenth century, and eventually called forth the energies of the learned *Pearson*, who has accurately and minutely investigated the subject in his *Vindiciæ Ignatianæ*. So explicit is the testimony of this venerable father to the authority and divine appointment of bishops, that those who denied such authority would naturally endeavour, by impugning his writings, to get rid of this weight of evidence against them; and the amazing difference which prevailed in the several editions of the epistles ascribed to him, gave them for a time no inconsiderable advantage in the contest. Without tracing at length the history of the different stages through which the epistles passed, till, reduced from *fifteen long* to *seven short* ones, they arrived at that degree of purity in which we now possess them; it may be worth while to inquire, upon what grounds we are justified in receiving them in this corrected form as the genuine productions of their reputed writer. The fact that *seven* letters were written by the martyr, on his way from Antioch to Rome, rests on the express authority of Eusebius (H. E. III. 36) and Jerome (Script. Illust. c. 16). It appears also, from the epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, which is still extant, that he transmitted to them a collection of all the epistles of Ignatius which had come to his hands; among which he particularly mentions those addressed to himself and the Church of Smyrna, of which he was bishop. Now we meet with quotations from one or other of these *seven* epistles in Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerome, and Theodoret; all which quotations occur, with one trifling exception, precisely in the same words in our present copies. This exception is evidently an error of the copyists of Irenæus (Hær. v. 28), who have substituted *ἄπρος Χριστοῦ* for *ἄπρος Θεοῦ*. A similar various reading is found in the MSS. of Acts xx. 28. On the other hand, no citation from these epistles has been met with which cannot be verified. It is clear, therefore, that the epistles which we now possess are intrinsically the same as those which were known to the Fathers above enumerated; nor is anything to be found in them—as Jortin has shown to be the case with those that are allowed to have been interpolated—which is inconsistent with the known character of the reputed writer, with the time in which he is said to have written them, or with the circumstances under which they are known to have been penned. Admitting, indeed, that our copies and those employed by Eusebius are the same, Daillé would persuade us that they were fabricated by some impostor, about 200 years after the death of Ignatius. Upon this supposition, the *seven* epistles, which Ignatius is universally acknowledged to have written, and which Polycarp collected together for the use of the church at Philippi, must have been lost and forgotten in the interval between the death of Polycarp and the time of Eusebius. Had the true epistles of Ignatius been in existence, it is altogether incredible that an historian, so diligent and so accurate as

D. *External evidence resumed:—Testimony of Polycarp.*—*Polycarp*, in his Epistle to the *Philippians*, supposed to have been written about A. D. 107, has passages and expressions from *Matthew*, *Luke*, the *Acts*; *St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians*, *Ephesians*, *Galatians*, *Corinthians*, *Romans*, *Thessalonians*, *Colossians*, *1 Timothy*; *1 Ep. of John*; and *1 of Peter*; and makes particular mention of *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*. Indeed his whole Epistle consists of phrases and sentiments taken from the New Testament. To the references in the margin might be added, C. 3. ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ὑμῶν, from *Galat.* iv. 26.—C. 6. Πάντα ἡμῶν σκοπεῖται (or μωμοσκοπεῖται), καὶ λέληθεν αὐτὸν οὐδὲν, οὔτε λογισμῶν, οὔτε ἐννοιῶν, οὔτε τι τῶν κρυπτῶν τῆς καρδίας. This is manifestly taken from *Heb.* iv. 12, 13.

E. *Testimony of Heretics.*—The Heretics also,³ who were contemporaries with the Apostles and Apostolical Fathers, bear Eusebius, should have been imposed upon by a forgery, which it must have been comparatively easy to detect; nor is it less improbable, that the letters of a bishop so highly beloved and respected as the martyred bishop of Antioch, collected as they had been for religious uses by his surviving friend, should have been so grossly neglected as to occasion their utter destruction within so short a period. At all events, it must be allowed that Polycarp was in possession of the genuine epistles of Ignatius. Two of them he mentions expressly; four out of the other five were written in his presence at Smyrna; and the fifth, addressed to the Philadelphians, was written at the same place and at the same time as that to Polycarp himself, and forwarded by his deacon, Burrhus, to its place of destination. There can be no doubt that these copies passed unimpaired into the hands of Irenæus, the disciple and friend of Polycarp; and Eusebius (H. E. v. 8) relates, that there were many quotations from them in works of that Father, which are now lost. If, therefore, such quotations had not appeared in the epistles of Ignatius, according to the transcript in the possession of Eusebius, their absence, or any variation in matter or manner, would have immediately detected the fraud and led to its exposure. We may further add that Origen, who was born some time before the death of Irenæus, has left two citations from these epistles, which are found in our copies; and from Origen to Eusebius the interval was too short to admit of the destruction of one series of the Ignatian Letters and the substitution of another. It is but reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the epistles which we now have, as divested of the corruptions which had been introduced into them subsequently to the time of Eusebius by Usher and Vossius, are the genuine writings of that Father. The interpolated copies are evidently forgeries of the sixth century; and the support which they lend to the Arian heresy plainly evinces the motive with which they were executed.—EDIT.]

³ On all points connected with the early heretics, the student is referred to the *Bampton Lectures* of the late learned and excellent Dr. Burton. Many *Apocryphal* books of the New Testament are still extant; and will be found in Jones' "Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament." Oxford, 1827.—EDIT.

their testimony to the existence of the New Testament; and most of them had their forged or interpolated Gospels and Epistles, as knowing that without something of this kind they could not hope to get and retain any followers.

Simon the magician, and his disciples, are said to have composed books for the propagation of their stupid doctrines, and to have ascribed those books to Christ and to the Apostles, that they might impose them upon silly people. If so, this was done in opposition to the books of the New Testament, and in imitation of them. The Christians afterwards were even with this Reprobate, for they related many an idle story about *him*, and also made him a more considerable impostor than probably he ever was, though he seduced several poor wretches.

The *Gnostics* admitted some, and rejected other parts of the New Testament.

The *Cerinthians* received part of St. Matthew's Gospel, and rejected everything else; particularly the Epistles of St. Paul, whom they had in great abomination.

The *Ebionites* and *Nazarenes* had a "Gospel according to the Hebrews," or a Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew, corrupted and interpolated. They had also other forged books bearing the names of Apostles.

The *Basilidians* admitted the New Testament, but with such alterations as they judged proper: and so did the *Valentinians*.

The *Carpocratians* made use of the Gospel of St. Matthew.⁴

These old heretics went about in quest of fools, whom they had the art to turn into madmen;—*hic homines prorsum ex stultis insanos facit*—an art, which is not to be reckoned amongst the *deperdita*. Before the end of the first century, the world was pestered with the disciples of *Simon*, *Menander*, *Saturninus*, and *Basilides*, concerning whom see Le Clerc, *Hist. Eccl.*

The *Basilidians* made 365 heavens, and were better castle-builders than those who give us schemes of the *seven heavens*, which is a poor inconsiderable number. Basilides required of his followers five years' silence, *which was a proper method*, as Le Clerc observes, *to make an experiment of their folly; and indeed*

⁴ See Tillemont, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. pp. 41, 51, 59, 109, 220, 225, 261, *Quarto Edit.* to which I shall always refer.

he might be sure that the scholar was mad in good earnest, who, with a profound submission and silence, had paid so long an attendance on a knave that taught and did a thousand absurdities. Basilides, in all probability, only required this silence from his disciples, when they were in his company, and was so great a talker, that he suffered nobody else to put in a word. His lectures upon the 365 heavens could not take up less time than a year, and he would never have ended them, if he had been interrupted, and obliged to answer doubters and cavillers.

F. *Collateral Testimony*.—The predictions of Christ concerning the calamities of the *Jews*, could not have been inserted as interpolations after the event ;—(1.) Because they are incidentally placed up and down⁵ in the gospels, by way of parable, or in answer to questions, or on account of some circumstance of time and place bringing on the discourse.—(2.) Because the books of the New Testament were received by Christians, and copied, and widely dispersed, and perhaps translated, from their first appearance.—(3.) Because these predictions in the gospels are alluded to, or the same thing is taught, in other parts of the New Testament.—(4.) Because no Jews or Pagans ever reproached the Christians with inserting them : not *Trypho*, not *Celsus*,⁶ not *Porphyry*, not *Julian*.—(5.) Because there is in

⁵ For example :—*Matt.* v. 5, *Blessed are the meek ; for they shall inherit the earth.* (This was literally fulfilled, when the believing Jews returned to their own country, after the destruction of Jerusalem) ; x. 23 ; xv. 13 ; xvi. 28 ; xxi. 19, 41, 44 ; xxii. 7 ; xxiii. 36 ; *Luke* xi. 50 ; xiii. 5, 9 ; xvii. 24 ; xix. 27, 42 ; xxiii. 28 ; *John* iv. 21 ; xxi. 22. To these must be added the parallel places from the other Gospels, and the prophecy of John the Baptist, *Matt.* iii. 10, *And now also the axe is laid to the root of the tree, &c.*

⁶ Whom some people call a *Jew* ; they might as well call him a *Quaker*, or a *Muggletonian*. The man was not even a proselyte of the gate, but a mere Epicurean philosopher, who, if proper pains had been taken with him, might possibly have become a Sadducee.

[This is one of those observations by which Jortin has incurred the charge of *flippancy*. It was in the self-assumed character of a Jew that Celsus, in the two first books of his "*True Word*," attempted to throw discredit upon the Gospel, and to persuade his pretended countrymen that nothing would be gained by a change of faith, insomuch as Christianity was merely a modification of Judaism. In the remainder of his work he throws off the mask, and maintains that nothing more is contained in the Gospel than might be collected from the dogmas of the heathen sages. With respect to the point under consideration, he not only does not question the accuracy of any of the facts related by the Evangelists, but endeavours from the

them a mixture of obscurity, and needless difficulty ; needless if they were forged. Christ foretold the destruction of the city and temple, and the calamities of the Jews, fully and clearly : but being asked when this should be, he gave an answer in a sublime and prophetic style, saying that the sun should be darkened, and the moon should not give her light, and the stars should fall from heaven, &c., which would not be easily understood, if learned and judicious commentators had not cleared it up. This he might possibly do to perplex the unbelieving persecuting Jews, if his discourses should ever fall into their hands, that they might not learn to avoid the impending evil. The believing Jews themselves, notwithstanding this prediction, stood in need of a second admonition, and were divinely warned to fly from Jerusalem.⁷ So loth are people to leave their own house and home, even when they see destruction at the door.—(6.) Because Christ not only foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, but the continuance of that desolation. *Jerusalem*, says he, *shall be trodden down of the Gentiles till the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled*.⁸ Take what interpretation you will, so it

facts themselves to impugn the credibility of the narrative. He even acknowledges the Gospels to have been “written by the disciples of Jesus ;” which is in itself a presumption of their genuineness and authenticity : for Celsus lived but little more than a century (A. D. 176) after the period at which the events thus recorded happened, and he had therefore ample means of ascertaining their truth. It is certain, moreover, that the Gospels we now have are precisely the same as those with which Celsus was acquainted ; for he quotes from them, and he quotes from no other.—EDIT.]

The objections of *Trypho* are to be found in *Justin Martyr* ; those of *Celsus* in *Origen* ; those of *Porphry* in *Holstenius*, Vit. Porph. (ch. xi.) ; and *Julian's* in his own works and in *Cyril*. *Trypho* had perused the Gospels, and says to Justin (Dial. Tr. c. 10) : ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ Εὐαγγελίῳ παραγγέλματα θαυμαστὰ οὕτως καὶ μεγάλα ἐπίσταμαι εἶναι, ὥς ὑπολαμβάνειν μηδὲνα δύνασθαι φυλάξαι αὐτά· ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐμέλησεν ἐντυχεῖν αὐτοῖς.

⁷ Eus. Dem. Ev. vi. p. 287. Οἱ γοῦν Ἀπόστολοι καὶ μαθηταὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰουδαίων εἰς αὐτὸν πεπιστευκότες, μακρὰν τῆς Ἰουδαίας γῆς γενόμενοι, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐπισπαρέντες, τὸν κατὰ τῶν οἰκούντων τὴν πόλιν ὕλεθρον διαδρᾶναι τότε ἐδυνήθησαν.

[Eusebius (Eccl. Hist. iii. 5) relates that all the faithful of the church of Jerusalem were warned by revelation to quit the city, and cross the Jordan to Pella ; and Epiphanius (Pond. et Mens. p. 171) says that they were directed by an angel to depart from the city, that they might not be involved in its approaching destruction. That they did so, see also Joseph. B. J. iv. 8. 2.—EDIT.]

⁸ Luke xxi. 24.

be not absurd, and add to it a matter of fact, namely, the state of the Jews ever since, and it must be owned that a considerable length of time is implied.—(7.) Because Christ declared that these evils should befall them for not knowing the time of their visitation, and for rejecting him; whence it followed, that as long as their rebellion and disobedience continued, the sentence against them would not be reversed.

If it should be said that Christ, as a wise and sagacious man, might foresee the storm,—“Εσσεται ἡμαρ, ὅτ’ ἂν ποτ’ ὀλώλῃ Ἰλιος ἱρὴ,”²—this would be a disingenuous shift to evade a plain truth. Christ would not have acted suitably to his character and usual conduct, and to common prudence, if he had staked his reputation on conjectures; and in the reign of Tiberius there was no appearance of such an event, and much less of the various circumstances attending it, which he foretold. The Romans had no interest to destroy and depopulate a country which was subject to them, and whence they reaped many advantages; and the Jews had not strength to hope for success in a war against them.

If it should be said that Christ took his prophecies from Daniel, his just interpretation of Daniel shows him to be the Messiah mentioned by Daniel, since none besides himself at that time had even a tolerable claim to that character. Daniel foretold, that in seventy weeks of years, or four hundred and ninety years, a most holy person should be anointed; that this Messiah should be cut off; that a prince should come with an army, and cause the sacrifices to cease, and plant abominable idols in the holy place, and destroy the city and temple, and make the land utterly desolate, and put an end to the Jewish polity.¹ But Christ is more explicit and circumstantial than Daniel, and in many respects his prediction was new and altogether his own.

Josephus says that the *zealots* trampled under foot all laws divine and human, and made a jest of their own sacred books, and derided the writings of the prophets:—ἐγελᾶτο δὲ τὰ θεῖα, καὶ τοὺς τῶν προφητῶν θεσμοὺς ὥσπερ ἀγυρτικὰς λογοποιίας ἐχλέναζον· ἦν γὰρ δὴ τις παλαιὸς λόγος ἀνδρῶν, ἔνθα τότε τὴν πόλιν ἀλώσεσθαι,

² *The day will come, when sacred Troy shall fall.*

¹ Dan. ch. ix.

καὶ καταφλεγῆσθαι τὰ ἅγια νόμῳ πολέμου, στάσις ἐὰν κατασκήψῃ, καὶ χεῖρες οἰκεῖαι προμιάνωσι τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τέμενος· οἷς ὍΥΚ ἀπιστήσαντες οἱ ζηλωταὶ διακόνους ἑαυτοὺς ἐπέδοσαν.² This seems to have been a traditional interpretation of Daniel; a λόγος, a report, and not a written prophecy. But here is a negative which seems to contradict what was said before. It should perhaps be οἷς ἀπιστήσαντες, or something to the same effect;³ and the meaning may be, that the impious Zealots caused those prophecies to be fulfilled in the destruction of themselves and their nation, which they had ridiculed and disbelieved.

Many of the first Christians, who were Jews dwelling in Judæa, sold their lands and possessions. The Gentiles did it not when the gospel came to them, and none of St. Paul's Epistles contain any such precept, or intimate any such practice. The Jews acted thus, though not by the command, yet doubtless with the approbation of the apostles, and the most probable reason for it was this: they knew that Christ had foretold the destruction of their country, which should come upon it before that generation were passed away, and therefore they thought it proper, whilst there was opportunity, to improve to the best use their estates, which they should not long enjoy, by relieving their poorer brethren, and by enabling the first teachers to pursue their travels from place to place. Therefore also when the gospel was spread amongst the Gentiles, the apostles were careful to make collections in their churches for the relief of the poor saints at Jerusalem, since it was just that a provision should be made for those who had given up all for the common good, and at whose charges the gospel was at first preached amongst some of the Gentiles.⁴

We read in the Acts of the Apostles that the Jews suborned and set up false witnesses against Stephen, who said, *We have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this holy place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us.*⁵ Now though these were calumniators, yet probably some-

² B. J. iv. 6. 3.

³ Perhaps, says a friend, it should be οἷς οὐκ ἐπιστήσαντες. Ἐπίστημι, amongst other things, means *animum intendere, animadvertere*, and the sense will be, *which predictions the Zealots not considering, or observing, or regarding, they caused them to be fulfilled.*

⁴ See Jos. Mede *Disc. on Prov.* xxxvii. 7.

⁵ Acts vi. 14.

thing had been said, which gave occasion to the accusation, and St. Stephen had been heard to mention the approaching destruction of Jerusalem, and the inferiority of the ceremonial to the moral law.⁶ This is one reason why the unbelieving Jews hated the disciples of Christ so implacably, because *they did not prophesy good concerning the nation, but evil.* Μάντι κακῶν, οὐ πώποτε μοι τὸ κήγγον εἶπας.⁷ The author of the *Recognitions of Clemens* introduces St. Peter telling the Jews that the temple would be destroyed; and adds, well enough, that upon this all the priests were highly enraged.⁸

The destruction of the Jewish nation is not mentioned by Jesus Christ, as a threatened calamity which might be averted by repentance, but as a decree which was fixed and unalterable. *If thou hadst known, &c., but now they are hid from thine eyes. —Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away:*⁹ that is, sooner shall heaven and earth pass away, than my predictions pass away unfulfilled. The best and the most probable method, by which a Jew might secure himself from being involved in this national evil, was to embrace Christianity: for which, amongst other reasons, St. Paul says to the Jews; *Beware therefore lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the Prophets: Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish, for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it to you:*¹ which words of St. Paul and of the Prophets, as they are applied by him, seem plainly to intimate the approaching ruin of that people. *Apud Lucam Paulus optime hæc verba aptat ad excidium simile eventurum per Romanos.*²—*Patet proprie de Chaldæis agi. Paulus tamen hoc opus paradoxum considerans tanquam cohærens cum aliis gravissimis Dei judiciis, processu temporis vulgandis in eandem gentem,—id ad judicia et mala, quæ Judæos sui temporis manebant, transtulit.*³

These things amount to an evidence which cannot reasonably be resisted: *ita res accendunt lumina rebus.* The ancient

⁶ See Grotius.

⁷ 1 Kings xxii. 8. Hom. Il. A. 106.

⁸ Recog. i. 64.

⁹ Luke xix. 42; xxi. 33.

¹ Acts xiii. 40; Habak. i. 5.

² Grotius ad Habac. i. 5.

³ Vitringa ad Jesai. x. 12. See him also on Isai. xxviii. 21, and Hammond on Acts xiii. 40.

Christians saw it plainly, and insisted upon it strongly,⁴ as upon a satisfactory proof of the truth of Christianity; and the proof is as evident now as it was then. It highly deserves the serious consideration of those who doubt or disbelieve. Whosoever is of a studious and inquisitive disposition, and not of a sanguine complexion, has probably known what it is to doubt; and has perhaps been offended at certain writers, who are incapable of owning or of feeling a difficulty, and who convince none, except those that stand in no need of conviction, and to some of whom it might be said, *Urbem proditis, dum castella defenditis*: but here is a prophecy, and here is a completion, to which if we can make no reasonable objection, we ought to admit the gospel of Jesus Christ, and to endeavour to know and to do his sacred will, accounting this to be the best foundation of our present hopes, and of our future happiness.

If the illustrious and most important prophecy which I have considered, and some others which shall be mentioned, have been evidently delivered, and evidently accomplished; and if the miracles of Christ and of his apostles may be proved, as I shall endeavour to show; it is a fair consequence, that Christianity is a true religion, and that it cannot be made false, or ambiguous, by any arguments drawn from the notions or from the behaviour of believers after the times of the apostles.

Much may be said, and something shall be offered in behalf of the Fathers and Christians of the three first centuries, who suffered so greatly for so good a cause, and whose abilities, if they are overvalued by some, are as much depreciated by others. No Christian would willingly give them up in any point, where there is room to defend them: but the imperfections and mistakes from which they were not free—and who is free?—and their credulity in some things, and in ages which were not critical, and a kind of credulity, to which an honest man, as such, is more liable than a crafty impostor, can never invalidate the proofs internal and external of the truth of Christianity.⁵

⁴ Euseb. H. E. iii. 7. Συγκρίνας δέ τις τὰς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν λέξεις ταῖς λοιπαῖς τοῦ συγγραφέως ἱστορίαις ταῖς περὶ τοῦ παντὸς πολέμου, πῶς οὐκ ἂν ἀποθαυμάσειεν θεῖαν ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ ὑπερφυῶς παράδοξον τὴν πρόγνωσιν τε καὶ πρόρρησιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὁμολογήσας.

⁵ On the real importance and value of the writings and testimony of the Fathers, it may be necessary to speak on other occasions.—EDIT.

The confirming and settling these great points, upon which our faith is founded, without a view to any particular systems and controversies, as it is the most agreeable employment to an ingenuous mind, so is it usually the most disinterested of all occupations. Whosoever is resolved to employ his hours and his labour in this manner, should consider himself as one who lays out his fortunes in mending the highways: Many are benefited, and few are obliged. If he escapes obloquy, it is very well: *Triumpho, si licet me latere tecto abscedere.*

I have only this to add concerning the present subject, that Christ having said of the city and temple, *one stone shall not be left upon another*, learned men have taken pains to show that this was exactly and literally fulfilled, either under Vespasian, or under Adrian, or in the time of *Julian*. If any one should be of opinion that they have not proved this point, I desire he would observe that the words are proverbial and figurative, and only denote utter ruin and desolation; and would have been truly accomplished, though every single stone had not been overturned: as a house or city is said κατασκαφῆναι, when it is destroyed, though its foundations be not dugged up. Malachi, foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem, says, *The day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.*⁶ This was truly accomplished, though every unconverted Jew did not perish in that general calamity. Proverbial sayings are not mathematical axioms.

Eusebius, mentioning the prophecy of Micah, *Zion shall be plowed as a field*,⁷ says: Εἰ γοῦν τι δύναται καὶ ἡ ἡμετέρα ἱστορία, καθ' ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς τὴν πάλαι βοωμένην Σιών ζεύγεσι βοῶν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀνδρῶν ἀρουμένην ὀφθαλμοῖς παρειλήφαμεν, καὶ τὴν γε Ἱερουσαλήμ, ὡς αὐτό γέ φησι τὸ λόγιον, ὁπωροφυλακίου δίκην ἀπολειφθέντος, ἐν παντελεῖ καταστᾶσαν ἐρημίᾳ.⁸ Eusebius was Bishop of Cæsarea, and lived near enough to have frequent opportunities of viewing the ruins of Jerusalem, and in them the completion of Christ's predictions. Now the words ἡ ἡμετέρα ἱστορία mean, *the knowledge and the testimony of what we have seen ourselves*; and the Latin tongue has no single word, which exactly answers to this

⁶ Mal. iv. 1.⁷ Micah iii. 12.⁸ Dem. Evang. v. p. 273.

sense of ἱστορία. Herodotus begins his book thus; Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνασσηῶος ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἥδε, which James Gronovius translates; *Herodoti Halicarnassensis curæ demonstratio hæc est*. But this interpretation stands in need of another. Kuster thus explains the place; *Notandum est ἱστορίην non solum denotare historiam, sive rerum gestarum narrationem, vel descriptionem; sed etiam, et quidem proprie, cognitionem rerum quas vel oculis ipsi lustravimus, vel ex aliis sciscitando didicimus; vel studium res varias eo, quo diximus, modo cognoscendi. Et quoniam primi et antiquissimi Historici vix alias res memoriæ prodere poterant, quam quas vel ipsi vidissent, vel ex aliis sciscitati essent, hinc recte et proprio sensu dicebantur ἱστορικοί. Postea vero latius, ut fieri solet, extensâ vocis ejus significatione, etiam quicumque alii rerum gestarum scriptores eodem nomine simpliciter appellari cæperunt. Proæmium Historiæ Herodoteæ Latine sic verterim: Rerum ab Herodoto Halicarnassensi curiose observatarum specimen hoc est. Vel per longiorem periphrasin: Curiositatis, quam Herodotus adhibuit, in rebus, quas narrat, vel lustrandis, vel sciscitandis, specimen, vel argumentum, hoc est. Ἡροδότου ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἥδε, ὥς μήτε, κ.τ.λ. Herodotus res a se observatas et investigatas edidit, ut neque, &c. Le Clerc thinks that ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις may be rendered *Quod in historiâ præstitit*. But, however, the observations of Kuster upon the word ἱστορίη are just and true.⁹*

V. ON PROPHECY IN GENERAL.

I now proceed to make some remarks on prophecy in general, and then on the prophecies of the Old Testament relating to our Saviour.¹

That God foreknows even all the future actions of men, is what the holy Scriptures most evidently suppose and prove, and what the bulk of mankind in all ages have believed. This opinion arose probably, not so much from arguments drawn from the Divine perfections, as from experience, tradition, and revelation. It appears in sacred history, that God Almighty from the most ancient times revealed himself to men by fore-

⁹ See *Le Clerc*, *Bibl. A. & M. V.* p. 385.

¹ On the subject of PROPHECY, the theological inquirer is referred to the works of *Sherlock*, *Newton*, *Hurd*, *Davison*, *Keith*, and *Faber*. See also *Twells' Boyle Lectures*, and *Bishop Chandler's Defence of Christianity, with the Vindication*.—EDIT.

telling future events, which is *prophecy*. The uses of prophecy, besides gradually opening and unfolding the things relating to the Messiah, and the blessings which by him should be conferred upon mankind, are many, and great, and manifest:—

1. It served to secure the belief of a God and of a providence. As God is invisible and spiritual, there was cause to fear that in the first and ruder ages of the world, when men were busier in cultivating the earth than in cultivating arts and sciences, and in seeking the necessities of life than in the study of morality, they might forget their creator and governor; and therefore God maintained amongst them the great article of faith in him, by manifestations of himself; by sending angels to declare his will; by miracles, and by prophecies. These were barriers against Atheism.

2. It was intended to give men the profoundest veneration for that amazing knowledge from which nothing was concealed, not even the future actions of creatures, and the things which as yet were not. How could a man hope to hide any counsel, any design, or thought, from such a being?

3. It contributed to keep up devotion and true religion, the religion of the heart, which consists partly in entertaining just and honourable notions of God and of his perfections, and which is a more rational and a more acceptable service than rites and ceremonies.

4. It excited men to rely upon God, and to love him, who condescended to hold this mutual intercourse with his creatures, and to permit them to consult him, as one friend asks advice of another.

5. It was intended to keep the people, to whom God revealed himself, from idolatry; a sin to which the Jews would be inclined, both from the disposition to it which they had acquired in Egypt, and from the contagion of bad example. The people of Israel were strictly forbidden to consult the diviners, and the Gods of other nations, and to use any enchantments and wicked arts; and that they might have no temptation to it, God permitted them to apply to him and to his prophets, even upon small occasions; and he raised up amongst them a succession of prophets, to whom they might have resort for advice and direction. These prophets were revered abroad, as well as at

home, and consulted by foreign princes; and in the times of the captivity they were honoured by great kings, and advanced to high stations.

Man has a strong desire to look forward, and to know things to come. This desire, if it be discreetly governed, is natural and innocent; and there are several things which it would be of great temporal benefit and advantage to foresee. For example, man would be glad to know how he may shun a future evil. Thus Noah was warned to build an ark, in which he and his family should be saved from the flood:—thus Lot was commanded to fly from Sodom, with his wife and daughters:—thus David was told to escape from a stronghold where he dwelt, and afterwards from Keilah:—thus in the pagan world, Socrates, as his disciples Plato and Xenophon affirm, had a *dæmon*, or *good genius*, who never exhorted him to anything, but dissuaded him from such things as would prove hurtful; by which secret warning he is said often to have preserved himself and his friends, and to have given them advice, which if they followed not, they constantly found cause to repent. *Olearius* and *Le Clerc*² believed that Socrates had such a *dæmon*; and I confess myself so far a fanatic, as to incline to the same opinion, but without blaming those who are of another mind³. When Socrates, just before he

² See a Dissertation of *Olearius* in Stanley's *Historia Philosophiæ*, and *Le Clerc Bibl. Chois.* xxii. p. 426, xxiii. p. 226, and *Silv. Philol.* c. 3.

³ Perhaps there is no question, in the whole extent of ancient literature, which has given rise to greater discussion than the *dæmon* of Socrates. From an attentive consideration of the passages of Plato and Xenophon, in which the subject is mentioned, it will appear that they, at least, entertained no notion of the visible manifestation of any being, corporeal or spiritual, to the external senses of the philosopher; but that they speak of some vivid impression upon the mind, which, from the persuasion that it was excited by divine influence, he called *δαιμόνιον*. He speaks of it, indeed, as a *voice*; but, doubtless, as a *still small voice*, speaking from within to the understanding, not outwardly to the ears. Thus he says, in Plato, (*Apol.* p. 31, C.) 'Υμεῖς ἐμοῦ πολλάχις ἀκηκόατε πολλαχοῦ λέγοντος, ὅτι μοι θεῖόν τι καὶ δαιμόνιον γίγνεται ἐμοὶ δὲ τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐκ παιδὸς ἀρξάμενον, φωνὴ τις γιγνομένη, ἥ, ὅταν γένηται, ἀεὶ ἀποτρέπει με τούτου, ὃ ἂν μέλλω πράττειν, προτρέπει δὲ οὐποτε. The report of Xenophon is to the same effect, except that he represents the admonitions, thus received, to have been both *hortative* and *prohibitive*. Thus in *Mem.* i. 1. 4, Οἱ μὲν πλείστοι φασιν ὑπὸ τε τῶν ὀρνίθων καὶ τῶν ἀπαντῶντων ἀποτρέπεσθαι τε καὶ προτρέπεσθαι. Σωκράτης δὲ, ὥσπερ ἐγίγνωσκεν, οὕτως ἔλεγε τὸ δαιμόνιον γὰρ ἔφη σημαίνειν. Καὶ πολλοῖς τῶν ξυνόντων προηγόρευε τὰ μὲν ποιεῖν, τὰ δὲ μὴ ποιεῖν, ὡς τοῦ δαιμονίου προσημαίνοντος· καὶ τοῖς μὲν πειθομένοις αὐτῷ συνέφερε, τοῖς δὲ μὴ πειθομένοις μετέμελε. Δῆλον οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἂν προέλεγεν, εἰ μὴ ἐπίστευεν ἀληθεύσειν. Ταῦτα δὲ

expired, ordered his friend to offer up a cock to Esculapius, it is possible that he was delirious, through the poison which he had taken; as a learned and ingenious physician observed to me⁴. Scribonius Largus says, *Cicutam ergo potam caligo, mentisque alienatio, et artuum gelatio insequitur: ultimoque præfocantur, qui eam sumserunt, nihilque sentiunt*⁵.

To this head belong sundry prophecies containing a double fate, if you will permit the expression, which should be accomplished according as men would act. Thus Jeremiah told the kings and the people of Judah, that if they would repent, they should be prosperous; if not, they should be destroyed: and to Zedekiah he privately declared; *Thus saith the Lord of hosts, If thou wilt assuredly go forth to the king of Babylon's princes, then thy soul shall live, and this city shall not be burnt with fire, and thou shalt live, and thy house. But if thou wilt not go forth*

τις ἂν ἄλλω πιστεύσειεν ἢ θεῷ. That by θεὸς he means, not the Deity himself, but the ideas which he suggests, is manifest from the opposition elsewhere marked between the δαιμόνιον and the human mind: as in Mem. i. l. 9, τοὺς δὲ μηδὲν τῶν τοιούτων οἰομένους εἶναι δαιμόνιον, ἀλλὰ πάντα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης γνώμης, δαιμονῶν ἔφη. Though Plutarch, in his treatise on the dæmon of Socrates, has introduced a variety of absurd and ridiculous stories regarding its admonitions, he still regards it merely as an influence, ἐπιθείαζον ταῖς αὐτοῦ προαριέσι (c. 10). He also coincides with Xenophon in affirming (c. 11), τὸ δαιμόνιον εἶναι τὸ κωλύον ἢ κέλευον. Cicero (de Divin. i. 53, 54), on the other hand, agrees with Plato. *Ut igitur, he observes, qui se tradit ita quieti, ut præparato animo quum bonis cogitationibus tum rebus ad tranquillitatem accommodatis, certa et vera videt in somnis; sic castus sensus purusque vigilantis et ad astrorum et ad avium reliquorumque signorum et ad extorum veritatem est paratior. Hoc nimirum est illud, quod de Socrate sæpe dicitur, esse divinum quiddam, quod δαιμόνιον appellat, cui semper ipse paruerit, numquam impellenti, sæpe revocanti.* Without acceding, therefore, to the opinion of Jortin, we shall admit all that is necessary for his argument, if we look upon this dæmon of Socrates as nothing else than the secret workings of a good man's conscience, exhorting him to good and deterring him from evil; and enabling him, by the judgment which he formed in relation to the course which he should himself pursue under like circumstances, to give that advice which was found to be so frequently serviceable to his friends.—EDIT.

⁴ There is no doubt but that such may have been the case. Certain poisons, which terminate fatally, produce delirium of the senses, previous to dissolution; as those of a milder nature operate only so far as to cause a temporary confusion of the intellect, followed perhaps by faintness and depression of spirits. An instance of the latter kind is mentioned at page 80 (note 8), in which the effects of a pill of opium lasted for some hours, without any unpleasant consequences. It is well known that similar results are occasioned, though for a much more limited period, by inhaling the oxide of nitrogen, commonly called *laughing gas*.—EDIT.

⁵ Compos. 179.

*to the king of Babylon's princes, then shall this city be given into the hand of the Chaldeans, and they shall burn it with fire, and thou shalt not escape out of their hand. Obey, I beseech thee, the voice of the Lord which I speak unto thee : so shall it be well with thee, and thy soul shall live*⁶.

Thus Achilles in Homer is represented as having a twofold conditional event declared to him : if he returned home, he was to prolong his days, but to live and die in obscurity ; if he continued in the army, he was to be cut off in the flower of his youth, but to obtain everlasting honour ; upon which he preferred glory to length of life.

Μήτηρ γάρ τ' ἐμέ φησι θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
 Διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέλοςδε.
 Εἰ μὲν κ' αὖθι μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
 ὦλετο μὲν μοι νοστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται.
 Εἰ δέ κεν οἴκαδ' ἴκωμαι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν,
 ὦλετό μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν, ἐπὶ δηρὸν δέ μοι αἰὼν
 ἔσσεται, οὐδέ κέ μ' ὦκα τέλος θανάτοιο κιχείη.⁷

The same poet tells us that Polyidus, a diviner, assured his son Euchenor, that, if he stayed at home, he should fall sick and die ; and if he went to Troy, he should be slain in battle : upon which the youth chose the latter fate.

Ἦν δέ τις Εὐχῆνωρ, Πολυίδου μάντιος υἱός,
 Ὃς ῥ' εὖ εἰδὼς κῆρ ὅλοήν ἐπὶ νηὸς ἔβαινε ;
 Πολλάκι γάρ οἱ ἔειπε γέρων ἀγαθὸς Πολυίδος
 Νούσῳ ὑπ' ἀργαλέῃ φθίσθαι οἷς ἐν μεγάροισιν,
 Ἢ μετ' Ἀχαιῶν νηυσὶν ὑπὸ Τρώεσσι δαμῆναι.⁸

Thus the Pagans had the same notion with that which is mentioned in Scripture, of a double destiny depending upon human choice.

Again, Man would be glad to know that he shall obtain a future good. Hope is one of the greatest comforts that poor mortals have in this world ; but a certain foresight of prosperity produces a more solid joy, and a firmer support. God made some favourable predictions to Noah. He promised a multitude of blessings to Abraham, relating to him, to his family, and to his posterity. When Hagar was driven from her home, she and her son, and cast out into the wide world, an angel comforted

⁶ Jerem. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20.

⁷ Il. I. 410.

⁸ Il. N. 663.

her, and assured her that her son should be the father of a great nation. God repeated the same promises to Isaac which he had made to Abraham. He revealed himself to Jacob, when he was forced to fly from his father's house, and gave him assurances of support and protection. He foretold to Moses, that by him he would deliver the people of Israel; and to Joshua, that he should be victorious in all his wars; and to David that he should be king of Israel, and that the kingdom should continue in his family. Jeremiah comforted Baruch in his affliction with this prophecy, *Thus saith the Lord, I will bring evil on all flesh, but thy life will I give thee for a prey in all places whither thou goest*⁹. He himself, who was a man of sorrows, and lived in calamitous times, received this consolation from God, *I am with thee, to save thee and to deliver thee*¹. He also received an order from God to say to Ebedmelech the Ethiopian, *I will bring evil upon this city, but I will deliver thee in that day, saith the Lord, and thou shalt not be given into the hand of the men of whom thou art afraid: for I will surely deliver thee, and thou shalt not fall by the sword, but thy life shall be for a prey unto thee, because thou hast put thy trust in me, saith the Lord*². In the New Testament we find that St. Paul, on some occasions, had a promise of deliverance out of the hands of his enemies. Our Saviour prophesied evil, that is, temporal evil, to all his disciples, and told them that they should be exercised with sufferings and afflictions; but to compensate this, he promised them in the present world peace of mind, and joy in the Holy Spirit, and the divine assistance, and in the world to come eternal happiness.

It must have been a great satisfaction to the illustrious persons whom we have mentioned, and to others recorded in sacred history, that they were secure of the divine favour and protection. This must have given them courage and constancy under all the difficulties of life, and have enabled them to look danger and distress in the face. The Greek poet, describing Ulysses as an example of prudence, patience, resolution, and presence of mind under a variety of trials, supposes that he had not only the assistance of Pallas, but a prediction from Tiresias, that he should at last return home, and subdue his domestic enemies,

⁹ Jer. xlv. 5.¹ Jer. xv. 20.² Jer. xxxix. 17, 18.

and reign happy over his happy subjects, and come to a good old age³.

To receive predictions of future unavoidable evils would be a curse rather than a blessing, and in the Scriptures when such predictions are delivered, it is by way of punishment. Thus God foretold to Eli all the evil which he would bring upon his family; and the Prophets denounced upon some occasions the calamities which should befall some wicked people, and the untimely death which they should not escape.

To know future blessings of which we shall partake, and to receive an admonition how we may avoid an impending evil, are favours which men would often be glad to receive; and these favours were granted to the people of God in ancient times and ruder ages, for several reasons which we have enumerated; but when by his son he had introduced a purer and sublimer religion, he no longer continued, under the Evangelical dispensation, to inform men of such temporal events. It is enough for a Christian to know that he may secure to himself everlasting happiness by his obedience. As the great things relating to the next state were more clearly revealed, the smaller things relating to this world, and to its frivolous concerns, were shut up in obscurity.

The knowledge of the things which will befall us, and our parents, and children, and friends, how long we and they shall live, and when and how we shall die, are secrets which God has concealed from us, and which in wisdom and kindness he has concealed from us⁴. Sometimes prosperous events come most agreeable when they are least expected, and it would be a sad thing to anticipate all our griefs, and to be miserable beforehand. And yet such has been the disposition of men in almost all ages, that many have had an intemperate desire of this knowledge, which gave rise and encouragement to wicked arts and to vile impostures. History, both ancient and modern, informs us of this, and affords us several examples of princes, statesmen, and politicians, who have had little or no religion, who have been

³ Odyss. A. 90.

⁴ Hor. Carm. iii. 29. 29 :—

Prudens futuri temporis exitum

Caliginosa nocte premit Deus.—EDIT.

mere atheists both in principles and in practice, as Tiberius, the cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin, and others, who yet were very credulous in this way, with all their free-thinking, and gave great heed to divination, and to predictions made by pretenders to those arts; so that irreligion and superstition are not at all inconsistent, and he who believes no God, may believe in evil spirits, or unknown powers, or fatal influences of the heavenly bodies. Pliny the elder, who had atheistical notions, yet says of earthquakes, that the mischief which they portend is as great as that which they cause, if not greater, and that the city of Rome was never shaken with one, which did not forebode future evil¹.

Il n'y a rien de si commun, que de voir les incredules entêtés de l'astrologie judiciaire, et persuadés que les magiciens font des choses qui sont au dessus de l'ordre de la nature. Par exemple, on accuse deux grands Ministres d'Etat, dont les actions ne nous laissent pas croire que la foi en Dieu fût une de leurs plus grandes vertus, d'avoir crû tous deux les predictions des astrologues; et l'un d'eux de s'être persuadé qu'un homme qui vomissoit diverses liqueurs, le faisoit par le moyen de la magie. "Le Cardinal de Richelieu," dit Vittorio Siri,² "consultoit, outre l'astrologie, toute sorte de divinations, jusqu'à des femelettes; dont la science consiste en des vapeurs de mer, qui leur font prédire par hazard quelque évènement fortuit. Il étoit si credule qu'il attribuoit à l'operation du Démon l'art de jetter par la bouche toutes sortes de liqueurs, après avoir bû de l'eau, comme le faisoit un charlatan Italien. Mazarin n'étant pas encore Cardinal, ayant éclaté de rire à un discours si simple, pensa perdre sa faveur par là; et le Cardinal irrité de cet éclat de rire, par lequel il jugea que Mazarin se moquoit de lui, lui dit ironiquement, qu'il n'étoit pas Monsieur Mazarin qui avoit une profonde étude et une exacte connoissance de tout. Mazarin repliqua tout soumis, qu'en donnant cinquante pistoles, que le charlatan demandoit pour enseigner son secret, on verroit si l'operation du Démon s'en méloit. Mazarin regardoit toutes les divinations comme des sottises, excepté l'astrologie, dont il étoit fort entêté, quoiqu'il feignît le contraire. Lorsque Madame

¹ Plin. N. H. II. 86. *Nec vero simplex malum, aut in ipso tantum motu periculum est; sed par aut majus ostento. Nunquam urbs Roma tremuit, ut non futuri eventus alicujus id prænuncium esset.*

² Mem. Rec. T. viii. p. 669.

Mancini sa sœur mourut, et ensuite la Duchesse de Mercœur sa nièce, comme il eut vû par-là accomplie la prediction, qu'un astrologue en avoit faite à Rome par écrit longtems auparavant, il en devint extraordinairement triste et mélancholique; non par tendresse pour ses parens, mais parceque ce même astrologue avoit fixé le tems de sa mort à un terme qui s'approchoit. Il en perdit l'appétit, et demeura plusieurs nuits sans dormir."

On sait aussi que l'Empereur Julien, qui n'avoit pû ajouter foi aux prophesies de l'Ancien et de Nouveau Testament, étoit excessivement addonné aux augures, et aux présages que l'on tiroit des entrailles des victimes; et les Payens mêmes l'en ont repris³. Je pose en fait que ces sortes de choses sont aussi difficiles à croire, si on les considère en elles-mêmes, que les mysteres et les miracles de la Religion Chrétienne. Mais les Incrédules y ajoutent foi, pendant qu'ils refusent de croire à l'Evangile; parce que ces sortes d'opinions n'ont aucun rapport avec la conduite de la vie, et ne sont nullement incompatibles, comme la Morale Chrétienne, avec leurs mauvaises habitudes.⁴

It is a question of importance, whether there has ever been in the Pagan world such a thing as *Divination*, or a fore-knowledge of things.⁵ The strongest argument against it is contained in Isaiah, where Almighty God foretelling many great events, particularly the raising up of Cyrus to destroy the Babylonian monarchy, and to deliver the Jews from captivity, declares that he alone can discover such things, and appeals to these predictions, as to proofs of his divinity, and evident arguments that there is no God besides him. *Produce your cause, saith the Lord, bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of*

³ Voyez Ammien Marcellin. L. xxv. c. 5.

⁴ Le Clerc, de *L'Incrédulité*. Part. I. ch. i. p. 32.

⁵ The question is *adhuc sub judice*, whether the diviners of antiquity were really enabled, by demoniacal assistance, to exercise the arts to which they pretended, or whether their practices were altogether a system of jugglery and imposture. One thing at least is certain, and it is all that calls for observation here, that the Scriptures denounce in the strongest terms every species of divination, maintaining the utter worthlessness of the information, be it real or pretended, which is thence derived. To the passages cited by Jortin, add Exod. xxii. 18; Lev. xix. 26, 31, xx. 27; Deut. xviii. 10; Isai. xlv. 25; Jer. xiv.; Jonah ii. 8. Those who would pursue the subject at large may consult Godwin's *Moses and Aaron*, Selden de *Diis Syriis*, Farmer's *Dissert. on Miracles*, Faber's *Origin of Pagan Idolatry*, and Gesenius on Isaiah, App. xi.—EDIT.

Jacob. Let them bring them forth, and show us what shall happen: let them show the former things what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or declare us things for to come. Show the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods: yea, do good, or do evil, that we may be dismayed and behold it together. Behold ye are of nothing, &c.⁶ And again: I have declared the former things from the beginning; and they went forth out of my mouth, and I showed them, I did them suddenly, and they came to pass. Because I know that thou art obstinate, and thy neck is an iron sinew, and thy brow brass: I have even from the beginning declared it to thee: before it came to pass I showed it thee; lest thou shouldst say, mine idol hath done them, and my graven image, and my molten image hath commanded them.⁷ And more to the same purpose. Hence it has been concluded that there never was such a thing as fore-knowledge in the Pagan world; a conclusion too large and absolute to be inferred from the premises.

Hinc possunt egregie confutari, qui putant frequentissime apud Ethnicos futura a Cacodæmonibus prænunciata; quod hic a nemine, nisi a se, fieri posse statuat Deus. Pleraque omnia illa oracula, quæ leguntur apud veteres Græcos, aut nunquam sunt edita, aut ab hominibus pronunciata, ut viri docti satis ostenderunt, et præsertim vir eruditus Antonius Van Dale. Sæpius hic repetitur provocatio Dei, ne leviter res prætereant, sed altius in animum descendat, præsertim idololatrarum Judæorum. “Imo vero,” dixissent Græci, “multa habemus oracula.” Sed Prophetæ reposuisset meras fraudes fuisse hominum, qui aut ambiguis responsis consultores eludebant, vel conjecturâ de rebus futuris temere judicabant, quam postea arguebat eventus. Si certe credidisset Cacodæmones ipsos fuisse oracula, aliter plane locutus esset, cum sciret homines ab ejusmodi malis spiritibus non difficulter potuisse falli, nec plebeculam eorum repona a responsis ipsius Dei satis posse discernere.—Non ita loquerentur qui fidem habent historiis Ethnicorum de ostentis et prodigiis, quæ potentiâ Cacodæmonum vere contigisse volunt; ex eorum enim sententiâ magna et memorabilia fuissent malorum spirituum per totum terrarum orbem opera. Sed Prophetæ longe malumus credere, quam

⁶ Isaiah xli. 21, &c.

⁷ Isaiah xlviii. 3—5.

*ejusmodi hominibus.*⁸ To these remarks we might add, that the Scriptures, though they seem in many places to allow that evil spirits may work miracles, yet nowhere suppose or intimate that they can predict the future actions of men, except perhaps in *Acts* xvi. 16 ;⁹ and there it is not necessary that such prophecy should be meant. In *Deut.* xiii. 1, it is said: *If there arise amongst you a prophet, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder—saying, let us go after other gods—that prophet shall be put to death.* But this seems not so much intended to declare that such false prophets should be able to show signs and work miracles, as to secure the people against idolatry; and therefore God says, if a man endeavours to seduce you to idolatry, put him to death, even though he should give you signs and wonders. Besides, the sign, whether real or pretended, might be rather of the miraculous than of the prophetic kind, and it could not be the prediction of a remote event, because that would not serve an impostor's purpose. The same remark may be applied to the *false prophets* in *Matt.* xxiv. 24;—*μάγοι* and *γόητες*, as Josephus calls them, who should show signs and wonders, but whose predictions and promises should be confuted by the event.

Prophecies, in one respect, seem to carry with them surer marks of proceeding from God, than *miracles*: for spirits, good or evil, may by their own natural strength, and without God's immediate assistance, perform things surpassing human abilities (which to men are miracles) unless God restrain them; but it seems altogether beyond the power of a created, finite, limited being to look into futurity, and to foresee the actions and behaviour of free agents, who as yet are unborn. This is an act, which probably implies a power equal to creation and preservation, and to upholding the universal system; and therefore prophecy must be the gift of God. An angel or an evil demon, if he foretells such remote events, must be inspired himself, or must get his knowledge from divine prophecies; or else what he delivers must be by a conjectural skill, in which he may perhaps sometimes, in some general things, aim right, and be able to form a better guess and judgment than mortal men, having larger views and longer experience. If he should have skill to foretell inclement seasons, droughts, tempests, inunda-

⁸ Clericus *ad Isai.* l. c.

⁹ See p. 62.—EDIT.

tions, pestilences, earthquakes, famines, fertility of the earth, plentiful harvests; yet to know what good and evil shall befall the unborn grandchildren of *Caius* and *Titius*, how they shall behave themselves, and how they shall spend their days, lies in all probability far beyond the sagacity of any creature.

In the book of *Tobit*, the angel Raphael says to Tobias, *Fear not, for she [Sarah] is appointed unto thee from the beginning, and thou shalt preserve her, and she shall go with thee: moreover I suppose that she shall bear thee children.*¹ Here is an angel's conjecture, which was fulfilled, as the writer takes care to inform us.² Whosoever he was who wrote the History of *Tobit*, his design seems to have been to draw the character of a pious and worthy man, who on account of his piety fell into great distress; and who, after having borne many calamities with resignation and constancy, was restored to prosperity, and led a long and happy life. He had a wife, pious and virtuous like himself, but once or twice a little too querulous; and a son, who was an amiable youth, and a dutiful child to his parents. Angels,³ good and evil, are introduced, with a sufficient quantity of the⁴ marvellous. The name itself of *Tobit* seems to be feigned; for *Tôb* in Hebrew means *bonus*.⁵ Lastly, both the heroes of the

¹ *Tobit* vi. 17.

² xiv. 12.

³ The Jews believed seven principal angels (*Zech.* iv. 10; *Revel.* i. 4; v. 6; viii. 2). One may suppose, from the number, that they were thought to preside over the planets (*Tobit* xii. 15).

[It should rather seem that *seven* is either used for any indefinite number; or, as *Arnald* observes, in his commentary on the text, that such was the reputed number of those who held the most exalted rank in the hierarchy of heaven. With respect to the ministry of angels, there is nothing inconsistent either with reason or scripture, in supposing their agency in furtherance of God's benevolent purposes, and keeping in check the malevolence of Satan. Under the Jewish and patriarchal dispensation, many instances are recorded of their engaging with certain favoured individuals in familiar intercourse; and, though much that is said of them in the Book of *Tobit* may very justly be deemed of questionable authority, the general truth of the narrative may as reasonably be admitted. See, on this subject, Bishop Gray's *Key*, and Horne's *Introduction*.—EDIT.]

⁴ Les Juifs ont débités un si grand nombre de fables, que leur histoire, depuis le tems des derniers des historiens sacres, n'est guère plus raisonnable que les plus fabuleuses histoires du Paganisme. Au moins il est certain qu'étant mieux instruits que les Payens, ils sont beaucoup plus blâmables d'avoir inventé tant de mensonges. *Le Clerc*, *Bibl. Chois.* iii. 166.

⁵ There are also other feigned names in this drama, concerning which see *Grotius*.

story are very long-lived ; the father lived 158, and the son 127 years. All this has the air of a pious fiction, and the author seems to have proposed to himself to imitate the book of *Job*.

Virgil makes the Harpy say,⁶ *Quæ Phæbo Pater omnipotens, mihi Phæbus Apollo Prædixit, vobis Furiarum ego maxima pando* :—where Servius remarks, *Notandum Apollinem, quæ dicit, ab Jove cognoscere*. Æschylus (Ἱερ.):—Ταῦτα γὰρ πατήρ Ζεὺς ἐγκαθίει Λοξία θεσπίσματα. And, Πατρὸς προφήτης ἐστὶ Λοξίας Διὸς. Apollo, says *Suidas*, is *Jupiter's* prophet, and delivers to men the oracles which he receives from him :—ὁ Ἀπόλλων ὑποφήτης ἐστὶ τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου λαμβάνει τὰς μαντείας, καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐκφέρει. In the *Hymn to Apollo*, the god says concerning himself :⁷ Χρήσω τ' ἀνθρώποισι Διὸς νημερτέα βουλήν. And in our learned poet, the Almighty is introduced saying to the Archangel Michael : *Reveal To Adam what shall come in future days, As I shall thee enlighten*.

To prophecy is to be adjoined a knowledge of the secret intentions of men. It seems to be beyond the abilities of any created being to know the thoughts of a man ; particularly of a man who is agitated by no passion, and gives no indications of his mind by any outward sign. This is ascribed to God, as his peculiar perfection, in many places of Scripture ; and it is said that he is *a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart, and understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts*.⁸ This knowledge God often imparted to the Prophets.

Cicero has treated the subject of *Divination* in two books. In the first he alleges all that can be said for it, and in the second he argues against it. Whosoever will examine his reasons on both sides, may see, I think, that he has not upset all the proofs which he has offered for it. He observes, that all nations, civil and barbarous, always agreed in this, that there was such a thing as divination, or a foreknowledge of events, to be obtained by various indications ; as by the stars, by portents and prodigies, by the entrails of victims, by omens, by lots, by forebodings, by consulting the dead, by oracles, by inspired persons, by dreams, &c.

If there is such a thing as divination, said the Pagans, there must be a Deity from whom it proceeds, because man by his

⁶ *Æn.* iii. 251.

⁷ *Hymn to Apollo*, 132.

⁸ *Heb.* iv. 12 ; *1 Chron.* xxviii. 9.

own natural powers cannot discover things to come; and if there be a Deity, there is probably divination, since it is not a conduct unworthy of the Deity to take notice of mortal men, and of their affairs, and on some occasions to advise and instruct them. Thus the Pagans argued, and accordingly, for the most part, they who believed a God and a providence, believed divination; they who were atheists denied it; and they who were sceptics decided nothing about it.

Divination was a matter of fact, and to be proved like other facts, by evidence, testimony, and experience: and some philosophers rejecting all other kinds of divination, as dubious and fallacious, admitted two sorts; that by *inspired persons*, and that by *dreams*. In favour of the latter we have the authorities of Socrates, Plato, Xenophon, and Aristotle.⁹ *Atque dormientium animi maxime declarant divinitatem suam. Multa enim, cum remissi et liberi sunt, futura prospiciunt, &c.*¹

When Socrates was in prison, Crito went to pay him an early visit, and told him, he was informed by persons come from sea, that the ship from Delos would return to Athens that day; the consequence of which was, that Socrates would be put to death on the morrow. "Be it so," said Socrates, "if it please the gods: yet I think the ship will not be here to-day, but to-morrow." "*Why so, dear friend?*" "Because this night a woman of a beautiful and majestic form, clothed in a white robe, appeared to me in a dream, and calling me by my name, said: *Ἡματί κεν τριτάτῳ Φθίην ἐρίβωλον ἴκοιο*, *The third day shall land thee safe at fruitful Phthia.*" They are the words of Achilles in Homer,² when he proposed to return home. Socrates took it for a prediction of his death, because he judged that to die was to go home to his own country. And his dream was accomplished.³

⁹ Cicero *de Divin.* i. 25. ¹ Cicero *de Senect.* 22. which is taken from Xenophon.

² Hom. *Il.* I. 363. The story is told in Platon. *Crit.* p. 44. See also Diog. Laert. in *V. Socrat.* & Cic. *de Div.* i. 25.

³ See Le Clerc on *Gen.* xii. 7. concerning revelations by dreams. Josephus has recorded a remarkable dream of *Glaphyra* (*Antiq.* xvii. 12. and *Bell. Jud.* ii. 7). But Noris (in his *Cenotaph. Pis.*), and Le Clerc (*Bibl. Chois.* iv. 60), observe that it cannot be true that Archelaus married the widow of Juba; whence it follows, that this dream of Glaphyra, supposed to be widow of Juba and wife of Archelaus, is either entirely, or partly false. He who would see some modern accounts of

As to the *Oracles*⁴ which were uttered in pagan temples, if we consider how many motives both of private gain and of dreams and prophecies, may consult Grotius (*Epist.* 405, *Part* ii.), or Le Clerc (*Bibl. Univ.* T. i. p. 152), and La Mothe le Vayer (*Problèmes Sceptiques*, xxviii.), and the life of Usher by Parr, and the visions of a strange fellow called *Rice Evans*, and Bayle's *Dict. Majus*, not. D., *Maldonat*, not. G., where he says of prophetic dreams, *De tels faits, dont l'univers est tout plein, embarrassent plus les esprits forts qu'ils ne le témoignent.* As the reader may not have the books to which I have referred, it may save him some trouble, and give him some satisfaction, or amusement, to peruse what follows:—"Quidam ad Landresium, in operibus, proximè oppidum cubans, somnio monitus ut cuniculum hostis caveret, surrexit. Vix egressus erat, prorumpit vis tecta, locumque disjicit. At Salmasium si videris, historiam tibi referet, patre suo auctore. Ad eum venit quidam Græcæ linguæ plane ignarus. Is in somnio voces Græcas has audierat; ἀπιθι οὐκ ἀσθάνη τὴν σὴν ἀτυχίαν; expectatusque Gallicis literis sonum earum vocum perscripserat. Cum ejus nihil intelligeret, rogatus Senator Salmasius ei verba interpretatur, est enim filii doctissimi doctus pater. Migrat homo ex ædibus. Eæ nocte sequente corruunt. Hoc his adjice quæ Cicero, Tertullianus, aliique ex omnium gentium historiis de somniis collegere: καὶ γάρ τ' ὅναρ ἐκ Διὸς ἐστὶν interdum, contra quàm censent Peripatetici. (Grotius, p. 870.) Le Clerc, where he gives an account of this passage, tells us, that Salmasius the father was *Conseiller au Parlement de Dijon*. La Mothe le Vayer seems to relate the same story that Grotius had from Salmasius, but with some difference. *Un Conseiller du Parlement de Dijon, nommé Carré, ouït en dormant qu'on lui disoit ces mots Grecs, qu'il n'entendoit nullement, ἀπιθι, οὐκ ἀσθάνη τὴν σοῦ ἀτυχίαν. Ils lui furent interprétés, abi, non sentis infortunium tuum; et comme la maison qu'il habitoit menaçoit de ruine, il la quitta fort à propos, pour éviter sa chute qui arriva aussitôt après.* La Mothe probably took his account from common rumour, when the story had undergone some alteration in passing from one to another. Ἀτυχίαν would be a more eligible word than ἀψυχίαν, if we were at liberty to choose; but we must take it as Salmasius gives it, and not alter the language of *Monsieur Le Songe*.

The story is to be found in the Life of Jacobus Guionius. *Cum Philibertus De La Marc, Senator Divionensis, vitam Jacobi Guionii describeret, non indignum sua narratione existimavit, quod non Guionio ipsi, sed Quarraeo collegæ, monitum nescio cujus Genii nocturnum acciderat.* "Sed me locus admonet, ne rem inauditam hactenus, et ideo seculorum omnium memoria dignissimam præteream; quam, etsi haud pertinere videatur ad Guionios, non abs re tamen hoc loco referre mihi visum est: seu, quia conscius illius fuit ac interpres Jacobus Guionius; seu, quod vix apud posteros fidem inveniet, nisi testium omni exceptione majorum, et illius inter alios cui illa contigit, testimoniis et subscriptionibus probata fuisset. Ea tamen fuit:—Foederatorum factione plus justo in Burgundia valente, Regiarum partium Præsides ac Senatores Semurium, primarium Mandutiorum oppidum, Regis nomine jus dicturi secesserant, cum Divione non liceret; ac inter eos Joannes Quarraeus, qui feliciter miscuerat ornamenta togæ artibus belli. Is iv. calendas Augusti MDXCIV. circa secundam diei horam matutinam sibi visus est motu subito expergefieri, et verba quædam ignota pronunciari, cum famulo propius decumbenti surgere, et lampadem

⁴ Of the *Pagan Oracles*, see Potter's *Grecian Antiquities*, and Hale's *Analysis of Chronology*, vol. iv. p. 109, 465.—EDIT.

national politics might have contributed to support them; and what many of the Pagans have said against them; and what

accendere jusso, præcepit, ut eademmet verba, quæ, ne sibi elaberentur, dentibus quasi retinere videbatur, scripto consignaret in hunc modum: *Ouy aposondes ton endon distiguion.* Quod famulus confestim exsecutus est, neutro eorum, Græcane illa essent, an Arabica, aut alia, sciente. Quarraeus quidem, quamvis abunde iis artibus excultus quæ viro Senatorio conveniunt, in suis Professionum tabulis, ex quibus hæc historia a me excerpta est, scribit ingenue, se Græci sermonis plane fuisse inscium. Summo demum mane pergens in Senatum Quarraeus Jacobo Guionio, quicum illi consuetudo intercedebat, obvius fit, et vix salutatum rogat, ut ille verba, quæ ex sola eorum asperitate Græca esse conjectabat, interpretari vellet; quæ, a Guionio lecta, Græca statim esse deprehendit, sed minime ex Homero excerpta, quod putavit novus quidam Philosophus; hac autem ratione describenda, *Οὐκ ἀπώσονται τῶν ἐνδον δυστυχίων.* Quibus et interpretationem addidit verbis totidem: *Non repulsuri quod intus infortunium.* Horum vero cum diu sensum simul perpendissent, et, si quid tristius in iis lateret, deprehendere conati fuissent, auctor fuit Quarraeo Guionius, ut, quia jam ex illa domo, quam Semurii incolebat, migrare constituerat, quod illius fœtori recurrentem iterum iterumque coeliacum dolorem, quem passus fuerat, tribueret, non longiorem in illa moram traheret. Sed longe gravius exitium illa verba portendebant, siquidem post dies octo, cum Quarraeus Reipublicæ causa Flaviniacum, Regiarum partium oppidum, perrexisset, domus illa a fundamentis convulsa de nocte repente concidit, fatalique nec penitus improvisa Guionio ruina suos incolas oppressit: cujus rei historiam eleganti carmine (ut audio) Guionius postea cecinit, quo tam charum Regi et Reipublicæ caput jure merito e tanta clade ereptum fuisse sibi et bonis omnibus gratulabatur, minime omissa, ut debuit, Socratis et Bruti Geniorum mentione." *Memorabilis hæc sane historia est, quæ, etsi ad Guionii personam non pertineret, occasione tamen a Guionio data inductus, minime prætermittendam existimavit Philibertus De la Marc: atque exemplo aliis fuit, quomodo in hoc argumento sit versandum.* (Morhof. *Polyhist.* i. 19, p. 217.) This seems to be the original (and a well-attested) story, whence the accounts of Grotius, Salmasius, and La Mothe le Vayer were derived. I am obliged to Mr. Samuel Johnson for referring me to this place in Morhof.

With respect to the visions of *Rice Evans*, Mr. Warburton has given me the following remarks on the man, and on his predictions; and the Bishop of Bangor (whose Dissertation on the destruction of Jerusalem is inserted above, pp. 14—17), and he have been willing to appear as my friends, and my coadjutors in this work,—

*Ibit et hoc nostri per sæcula fœdus amoris,
 Doctorumque inter nomina nomen ero:
 Forsan et extinctum non spernet Patria dulcis,
 Forsitan et dicet, Tu quoque noster eras.
 Talibus inferiis placabilis Umbra quiescet,
 Lenibunt Manes talia dona meos.
 Interea Labor ipse levat fastidia vitæ:
 Æterno rectum sub Duce pergat iter!
 Scriptores sancti, salvete, et cana Vetustas;
 Salve, Musa, nimis blanda tenaxque comes:
 Tu, puero teneris penitus dilecta sub annis,
 Tune etiam emerito cura futura viro?*

obscure and shuffling answers they commonly contained; and into what scorn and neglect they fell at last; we must needs

Ne tamen æternum, mæsta atque irata, recede ;

Sed raro, sed vix sæpe rogata, veni.

Hæc, Fortuna, tuis non sunt obnoxia regnis ;

Livor in hæc poterit juris habere nihil.

“ You desired to have a more particular account of a certain prophecy of one *Rice Evans*, which you have heard some of your friends speak of in terms of astonishment. As I have his book, which is scarce, I am able to give you that satisfaction. But it may not be amiss first to let you into the character of the prophet. *Rice Evans* lived and flourished in the last century, during the time of our civil confusions. He was a warm Welshman, and not disposed to be an idle spectator in so busy a scene. So he left his native country for London; and finding, on his arrival there, that *inspiration* was all running one way, he projected to make a diversion of it from the round-heads to the cavaliers, and set up for a prophet of the royalists. He did and said many extraordinary things to the grandees of both parties: and it must be owned, he had a spice of what we seldom find wanting in the ingredients of a modern prophet;—I mean *prevarication*. Of this he has himself given us a notable example in the forty-second page of his Tract, called *An Echo from Heaven*, &c. :—which, because it contains an uncommon fetch of wit, I shall transcribe. *There are two confessions, says he, subscribed by my hand in the city of London, which, if not now, in after-ages will be considered. The one was made at the Spittle, and subscribed with the right hand, in the aforesaid vestry, before Sir Walter Earl; and that is a confession made by the inner man, or new man. The other confession is a confession of the flesh, called the outward man, or the old man; and the confession I made before Green [the Recorder], and subscribed with the left hand; as the difference in the writing, being compared, will make it appear. I know the bench and the people thought I recanted: but, alas! they were deceived.*

“ Well, but this very man has in the seventy-seventh and seventy-eighth pages of this *Echo* (printed for the author in 12mo, and sold at his house in Long Alley, Blackfriars, 1653, second edition, with additions), a prophecy which astonishes all who carefully consider it. It is in these words :—

“ *A Vision that I had presently after the king's death.—I thought that I was in a great hall, like the shire-hall, in the castle in Winchester, and there was none there but a judge that sat upon the bench, and myself; and as I turned to a window north-westward, and looking into the palm of my hand, there appeared to me a face, head, and shoulders, like the Lord Fairfaxes, and presently it vanished again; then arose the Lord Cromwell, and he vanished likewise; then arose a young face, and he had a crown upon his head, and he vanished also; and another young face arose with a crown on his head, and he vanished also; and another young face arose with a crown upon his head, and he vanished also; and another young face arose with a crown upon his head, and vanished in like manner: and as I turned the palm of my hand back again to me, and looked, there did appear no more in it. Then I turned to the judge, and said to him, There arose in my hand seven, and five of them had crowns; but when I turned my hand, the blood turned to its veins, and there appeared no more: so I awoke.*

“ The interpretation of this vision is, that after the Lord Cromwell there shall be

have a contemptible opinion of them in general. We cannot fix upon any oracles on which we can depend, as upon prophecies

kings again in England ; which thing is signified unto us by those that arose after him, who were all crowned ; but the generations to come may look for a change of the blood, and of the name in the royal seat after five kings reign once passed (2 Kings x. 30).” [The words referred to in this text are these, *And the Lord said unto Jehu, because thou hast done well, &c. thy children of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel.*]

“The restoration of the monarchy is here plainly predicted ; together with the crown’s passing from the house of Stuart into another family. But the prophet at first sight appears to be doubtful about the number of reigns before that event. He reckons up in his hand only *four* successions to the monarchy, yet in his speech to the judge he calls them *five* : in his interpretation he says the change shall be after the reign of *five* kings ; and yet referring, in conclusion, to a text in the second book of *Kings*, we are brought back again to the number *four*. But it is this very circumstance which makes the prodigious part of this affair. A good guesser (who, an ancient writer says, is the best prophet) might reasonably conjecture that the monarchy, after the subverter of it, Cromwell, was taken off, would be restored ; and, if it continued in the same family for *four* or *five* generations, that was as much as, in the ceaseless revolutions of human affairs, could be expected. But we shall find there was something more in this matter. The succession of the house of Stuart, during the course of these *four* generations, was disturbed, and that circumstance our prophet has distinctly marked out. The *four* crowned heads he saw in his hand denote Charles II., James II., Queen Mary, and Queen Anne. They are afterwards called *five* : and so they were ; for King William III. shared the sovereignty with Queen Mary, and reigned alone after her. But he being of another family, when the *succession* in the house of Stuart is reckoned up, he could not be numbered : so they must be there called *four*. When the prophet reckons the *reigns*, King William comes in, and then they are called *five*. The key to this explanation is the text he concludes with—*Thy children of the FOURTH generation shall sit on the throne.*

“A great and extraordinary genius lately deceased, struck with this wonderful coincidence, hath written with his own hand in the margin of the page, these words, *A manifest prophecy.* You know who I mean. But every one must judge for himself, unless (which I had rather) you would give us your own sentiments upon it.”

“But now my hand is in, as you have had one of his *visions*, you shall have a *dream* too, as he tells it in the twelfth page of the first, and the eighth page of his second edition.—*My heart was for London, and as one Mr. Oliver Thomas preached, —Cant. ii. 10, Arise up, my love, my fair one, and come away, my heart was allured with it, that I thought it was a hastening of me to London ; and at that time in a dream methought I was on Islington-hill by the water-house, and London appeared before me as if it had been burnt with fire, and there remained nothing of it but a few stone walls : but I made nothing of this dream.* Whosoever reflects upon what we are told by Burnet, in the *History of his own Times* (vol. i. p. 231), of the condition in which the works were put at the *water-house* at *Islington*, when the fire of London happened, cannot but think Evans’ making this the scene of his dream a very unaccountable circumstance. His telling us that *he made nothing of this dream*, adds to the credit of his relation.”

which were pronounced and fulfilled; and if there were any such, which on the other hand we cannot absolutely deny and disprove, they are irretrievably lost and buried under the rubbish of the false, ambiguous, and trifling responses, which history has preserved; and those, which have a plausible appearance, lie under the suspicion of having been composed after the event. Some of them were in such doggerel verse, that they cast a grievous reproach upon the god of poetry, from whom they were supposed to proceed, and betrayed the poor capacity of the laureate poet.

In the class of knaves and liars must be placed the generality of *soothsayers*, *magicians*, and they who made a craft and a livelihood of predicting, and drew up the art into a system. Setting aside these sorts of divination, as extremely suspicious, there remain predictions by *dreams*, and by sudden impulses upon persons who were not of the fraternity of impostors. These were allowed to be sometimes preternatural by many of the learned Pagans; and cannot, I think, be disproved, and should not be totally rejected.⁵ If it be asked whether these dreams

It is observable that in the first edition printed in the year 1652, Evans reckons up *five*, not *four*, young faces in his hand, and he concludes only thus: *All that I apprehend by this vision is, that after the Lord Cromwell we shall have a king again in England.*

My thoughts are the same with Mr. Warburton's, that the visions of Evans are a curiosity deserving to be known, but not a foundation to build anything upon. If there be in them any forgery, which the difference between the first and second editions once inclined me to suspect, they who can detect it will oblige us and many others by the discovery.

Evans says (p. 16 of edit. 1652)—*Being perfectly awake—a voice said to me, Go to thy book; whereupon—I suddenly started up, and to the table I went, where my Bible lay open, immediately fastening my eyes upon Ephes. v. 14, being these words, Wherefore he saith, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light, &c.* The same thing he did at other times. Evans, who was illiterate, little thought that he was practising a kind of divination in great request amongst the Pagans, and the ancient Jews and Christians, who had recourse to their *Sortes Homericae*, *Virgilianæ*, *Evangelicæ*, and *Biblicæ*. The same causes produce the same effects, and nothing is more like one Enthusiast, Mystic, Cabbalist, or Quietist, than another.

⁵ Many dreams have been placed on record, both in ancient and modern times, which are unquestionably striking; nor can it be denied that God *may* avail himself of this means of communication between himself and his creatures. At the same time, they may also have been invented for the purposes of imposture; or superstition may have attributed to divine revelation the effects of the natural working of the mind. Without adverting to those instances, in which God is expressly stated

and impulses were caused by the immediate inspiration of God, or by the mediation of good or of evil spirits, we must confess our own ignorance and incapacity to resolve the question.

There is a history in the Acts of the Apostles, which seems to determine the point in favour of divination. *A certain damsel, says St. Luke, possessed with a spirit of divination, met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying. The same followed Paul and us, and cried, saying, These men are the servants of the Most High God, which show unto us the way of salvation. And this she did many days; but Paul being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour*⁶. Thus the divine Providence so ordered it that this occurrence should turn greatly to the honour and advancement of Christianity. But this prophetess might be in repute for discovering lost or stolen goods, or for revealing what happened in distant places, or for predicting changes of weather, or for many things of a like nature; and might not be able to foretel the future actions of men’.

in Holy Writ to have made his will known by dreams to his servants, there is one instance, at least, in Scripture, in which a heathen seems to have received a divine communication of this nature. The dream of Pilate’s wife (Matt. xxvii. 19) has indeed been referred to natural causes; and it has been suggested that the miracles of Christ had made some impression upon her mind, and that her anxiety in his behalf induced the fearful forebodings which she experienced in her sleep. Others have more unaccountably referred the dream to the agency of the devil, who may have wished to have prevented the death of Christ, in order to contravene the prophecies. An unbiassed perusal of the narrative, however, leads almost involuntarily to the idea of something supernatural. Now there is a circumstance precisely similar related by Appian (B. C. ii. p. 814); to which may be added the celebrated dream of Calphurnia, recorded by Valerius Maximus (i. 7. 2), and imitated by Shakspeare in his *Julius Cæsar* (Act ii. sc. 2). Still it does not follow that, because one dream is divinely communicated, all are equally so. Indeed, it is more than probable that the record of a divine dream has led to the invention of fictitious ones; and consequently that none can be decidedly received as preternatural, except those which the Word of God has declared to be such. On the theory of dreams in general, see Baxter’s *Essay on the Phenomenon of Dreaming*, and D. Stewart’s *Elements of the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, pp. 328, &c. There is also a clever and interesting paper on the subject in the new series of Chambers’ “*Edinburgh Journal*,” vol. i. p. 113.—EDIT.

⁶ Acts xvi. 16.

⁷ From the whole tenor of the narrative, it is manifest that this was a case of *demoniacal possession*. What is called in the Eng. Tr. a *spirit of divination*, is, in the original, πνεῦμα Πυθῶνος; and it should seem that her phrenzied manner and wild gesticulations, similar to those with which the responses of the *Pythian priestess* were delivered, gave rise to the appellation bestowed upon the demon.—EDIT.

As to Isaiah, we may infer, with *Vitringa*, from his words, that God was determined so to conduct the great revolutions which were to be brought about in the world, and so to order the things relating to the victories of Cyrus, and to the fall of Babylon, that his predictions should be accomplished, and that the Chaldæans and other pagan prophets should be filled with the spirit of error and of ignorance. *I am the Lord, that frustrateth the tokens of liars, and maketh diviners mad*⁸. And again he declares that the idols of Babylon should be destroyed, and their false gods not able to defend themselves. So that the declarations in Isaiah may be supposed to relate to the predictions made by Isaiah and by other prophets, in which their superiority over the diviners should manifestly appear, to the confusion of their pagan neighbours. This, I say, follows; but not that, where there was no competition between the God of Israel, and the pagan deities, no such thing as divination should ever be found in any age, and in any part of the Gentile world.

It may be said that, in all probability, God will not endue bad angels with the spirit of prophecy, or permit them to reveal things to come. It is probable indeed he will never do it, where there is a competition between true religion and idolatry, and when it would make men worse than they would else be. But it appears from the Scriptures, that the prophetic *afflatus* has sometimes inspired bad men; and we cannot be certain that God may not bring about some of the designs of Providence even by evil spirits, by unworthy creatures, and immoral agents: much less can we be certain that good angels were never employed, as ministering spirits, among the Pagans. Milton treats this subject in his "Paradise Regained," and makes Christ say to Satan:

— Whence hast thou then thy truth,
But from him [GOD] or his angels president
In every province, who themselves disdaining
T' approach thy temples, give thee in command
What to the smallest tittle thou shalt say
To thy adorers?⁹

It may be said also that divination among the Pagans helped, indirectly at least, to support idolatry and paganism. Socrates,

⁸ Isai. xliv. 25.

⁹ i. 446.

and Plato, and Xenophon, and other worthy men believed divination by dreams and impulses; and this opinion had a tendency to confirm them in their religion, that is, in the belief of a supreme God, and of inferior gods, and good demons. It may be so: but the divine Providence seems hitherto never to have intended that Judaism, or afterwards Christianity, should be the religion of all mankind; since neither of these religions were ever fairly proposed to all mankind¹. Divination, or the opinion of it, contributed to keep up paganism in pagan nations; it contributed also to keep out atheism; and there is a sort of paganism which, such as it is, is far better than atheism, with Bayle's leave be it said, who was pleased to affirm the contrary; and who, whatsoever was his design, has highly obliged all atheists and infidels by many arguments and remarks scattered up and down in his writings. Bayle was not the inventor of this hypothesis, though he adorned and improved it. Lucretius and other *esprits forts* had maintained it: *Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona*². There may have been modes of idolatry which were worse than atheism, and which indeed, strictly speaking, were a kind of atheism, as Bayle and others have truly observed: there may have been atheists in the pagan world who were better citizens and honester people than many of their superstitious countrymen; and some epicureans, as to personal qualities, might be preferable to some peripatetics and stoics. Atheism, in idolatrous nations, and in former ages, was not altogether so great a depravity as it is now; since natural religion has received so much friendly aid from natural philosophy, and from the excellent Newtonian system, and has been so well illustrated and confirmed by many skilful writers. Deism likewise is not so bad in places where Christianity is clouded and defaced by superstition, as it is in countries where revealed religion is free from such gross errors and defects. There have been several idolaters, Jews, Mahometans, and Christians; several reverend inquisitors, *compellers to come in*,

¹ This does not seem to be put correctly. *Judaism* was certainly never designed for universality; but Christianity is so designed, though its progress, in the very nature of things, can only be gradual.—EDIT.

² Illud in his rebus vereor, ne forte rearis
Impia te rationis inire elementa, viamque
Endogredi sceleris: quod contra sæpius olim
Religio peperit scelerosa atque impia facta.—Lucret. i. 81.

propagators of the faith by sword, halter, and faggot ; who have been viler persons than several atheists ; and religion may be corrupted to such a degree, as to be worse than unbelief : but if a man will needs draw the comparison between atheism and idolatry, it is not fair to take the worst kind of superstition, and the most ignorant, flagitious, and infamous Pagans who were infected with it, and oppose to them the better sort of atheists, ancient and modern, who lived reputably ; and tell us that Epicurus, and Cassius, and Atticus, and Pliny, and Spinoza were more to be esteemed than many believing Pagans, or perhaps Christians.

We must consider Paganism in the whole, as it has been from the time when it began, to this day, in all ages, and in all places ; and the question is, whether, if all these Pagans had been atheists, it had been better for civil society in general, or no. On this question most of those who are not atheists, I presume, will choose the negative ; and of the atheists, all will not take the affirmative : for there have been atheists, who have thought that infidelity was only fit for polite gentlemen, and that religion was of use amongst the vulgar, and a good state-engine. The remark therefore of this author is rather lively than pertinent, that *he is not a greater madman who pays adoration to no being, than he who should devoutly worship his dog, his hat, or his breeches.*

Homer has described to us a republic, if we may call it so, of a sort of atheists, or despisers of the gods. Polyphemus says to Ulysses :³ *Stranger, thou art a fool, or thou comest from a far country, to talk to me of the Gods ; we are superior to them, and value them not.* The Cyclopes, says Homer, have no religion, no magistrates, no assemblies, no laws, no industry, no arts and sciences, no civility, no respect for one another ; but each Cyclops, in his den, rules over his wife and children as he thinks fit, and eats all the stragglers that fall into his hands.⁴ An excellent image of atheistical polity !

³ Hom. Od. I. 273. Νήπιος εἷς, ὃ ξεῖν', ἢ τηλόθεν εἰλήλουθας,
Ὅς με θεοὺς κέλεαι ἢ δειδέμεν, ἢ ἀλέασθαι.

[The last words are wrongly translated in the text. Render : *that I should either fear or regard them.* The origin of the error will appear by referring to the Homeric context.—EDIT.]

⁴ Hom. Od. I. 112—115.

Bayle had confirmed himself in an opinion that the Pagans worshipped a rabble of coequal, imperfect, vicious gods; not considering how much the doctrine of one supreme and of many inferior gods prevailed: and for this reason he is the more excusable when he prefers atheism to such idolatry. "As to the grace of God," he says, "the Pagans and the atheists are equally destitute of it; and none have it besides the regenerate, who cannot lose it, and who are predestinated to life eternal." Who taught him all this? Not the⁵ Scriptures, from which he could not prove it; not the ancient Fathers, who were generally of a contrary opinion, and entertained favourable sentiments of the wiser Pagans; not human reason, which, according to him, was only a *jack-a-lantern*, leading those who followed it into bogs and ditches; not the Synod of Dort, and some modern Supralapsarians, whom he despised in his heart. He only threw out this as an *argumentum ad hominem*; and he uses the same sort of argument, when he tells us, with a serious face, that Epiphanius, Jerome, and other doctors of divinity, ancient and modern, have declared *heresy* to be worse than *atheism*. As if there were any absurdity, that some doctor, as well as some philosopher, has not maintained! Jerome's learning and abilities deserve to be honoured, but his impetuous temper is no secret to those who have looked into his writings. When he was warmed with disputing, he would call

Hunc Furiam, hunc aliud, jussit quod splendida bilis.

There have been Pagans, who have believed in one God, great and good; and in inferior deities deriving their powers and perfections from the Father of gods and men, themselves good and beneficent, and guilty of none of those vices and follies which poetical and fabulous history ascribed to them. They have also perhaps believed that there were malevolent Demons, who were sometimes permitted to do mischief, but who were subject to the power and control of the Deity; and certainly such a religion (though accompanied with some degree of superstition), together with a belief of the *honestum* and the *turpe*, and with a tolerable system of morality, and with some

⁵ See *The Imperfect Promulgation of the Gospel considered*, in a very good Sermon by Bishop Bradford.

conjectural hopes of a life after this, is far preferable to atheism ; to the doctrine that a God, and a providence, and another state, are *Rumores vacui, verbaque inania, Et par sollicito fabula somnio*. I pretend not to deny that some atheists of old had notions of the *honestum* and the *turpe*, and might act suitably to them : yet surely they had not so many motives to virtue, as the Pagans of whom I am now speaking.

“ But,” says *Bayle*, “ if you had examined these Pagans, and reasoned with them concerning the supreme God, you would have found that they entertained some notions, the consequences of which were absurd, and would have destroyed the fair idea.” And is not that the case of some Jews and Christians? Men must not be charged with all the consequences, which may perhaps regularly follow from their notions, whilst they neither draw them, nor perceive them, nor own them.

Which system is best, that of Socrates, or that of Epicurus? that of the Platonics, or Stoics, or that of Hobbes, of Spinoza,⁶ and perhaps of Bayle, who too often made a bad use of his great abilities, and who taught that a man could not believe that God was good and wise, and that Christianity was true, without sacrificing *reason to faith* ; or, in plain English, without renouncing common sense?

This ingenious and unaccountable author had frequent quarrels with *Reason*, which at last ran so high, that he gave her a bill of divorce, and turned her out of doors, with *Res tuas tibi habeto*. And yet, when he had discarded her, he would reason against her; that is, *Nec tecum possum vivere, nec sine te* ; an absurdity, which sticks, like the shirt of Hercules, to all those,

⁶ Spinoza has endeavoured to show that there can be no such thing as liberty, and that there is no God. But how? By a system of jargon, adorned at proper distances with Q. E. D. Great is the force of *initial letters* ! Yet has this absurd and cloudy philosopher found admirers and disciples, who have followed him, as they say the *tiger* follows the *rhinoceros*, to eat his excrements. Spinoza held a *plenum*, which was necessary for his purpose. If there be a *vacuum*, Spinoza's God, or the material world, is a limited, imperfect substance, and depends on some cause. Absolute *perfection* neither requires nor admits a cause, or an antecedent reason : but of *limitation* and *imperfection* there must be some cause. Spinoza would have owned this consequence from the admission of a *vacuum* ; for he says, that what is necessarily existing, must be infinite. He should therefore have proved the existence of a *plenum* :—*Quod Erat Demonstrandum*. The doctrine of a *vacuum* is the sponge of all atheistical systems.

of all denominations, who argue against *Reason*, as against a false and fallacious guide. To rail at her, and call her names, though it be not so genteel, yet is rather less ridiculous, for she will never furnish arms against herself. But these persons are usually as fond of their notions, as Job was of his integrity; they *hold them fast, and will not let them go*: and who would dispute with those who, upon their own principles, must neither give nor take a reason?

⁷ M. Bayle a prétendu prouver qu'il valoit mieux être athée qu'idolâtre; c'est à dire, en d'autres termes, qu'il est moins dangereux de n'avoir point de tout de religion, que d'en avoir une mauvaise. Dire que la religion n'est pas un motif réprimant, parce qu'elle ne réprime pas toujours, c'est dire que les lois civiles ne sont pas un motif réprimant non plus. C'est mal raisonner contre la religion de rassembler, dans un grand ouvrage, une longue énumération des maux qu'elle a produits, si l'on ne fait de même celle des biens qu'elle a faits. Si je voulois raconter tous les maux qu'ont produit dans le monde les lois civiles, la monarchie, le gouvernement républicain, je dirais des choses effroyables. Quand il serait inutile que les sujets eussent une religion, il ne le serait pas que les princes en eussent, et qu'ils blanchissent d'écume le seul frein, que ceux qui ne craignent pas les lois humaines, puissent avoir. La question n'est pas de savoir, s'il vaudroit mieux qu'un certain homme ou qu'un certain peuple n'eut point de religion, que d'abuser de celle qu'il a; mais de savoir quel est le moindre mal, que l'on abuse quelquefois de la religion, ou qu'il n'y en ait point du tout parmi les hommes. Pour diminuer l'horreur de l'athéisme on charge trop l'idolatrie. Il convient que, dans le gouvernement despotique, il y ait quelque livre sacré qui serve de règle. Le Code Religieux supplée au Code Civil, et fixe l'arbitraire. Le roi de Perse est le chef de la religion, mais l'Alcoran règle la religion; l'empereur de la Chine est le souverain pontife, mais il y a des livres qui sont entre les mains de tout le monde, auxquels il y doit lui-même se conformer. En vain un empereur voulut-il les abolir; ils triomphèrent de la tyrannie.—*L'Esprit des Lois*, l. xxiv. ch. 2; l. xii. ch. 29; l. xxv. ch. 8.

Je ne suis pas du sentiment de M. Bayle, que l'athéisme soit préférable à l'idolatrie Payenne, en tout sens. Pour répondre à la question, il faudroit, ce me semble, premièrement distinguer des sociétés, les opinions considérées d'une manière abstraite, et faire d'un côté la description de l'athéisme, et de l'autre celle de l'idolatrie. L'on trouverait peut-être qu'il y a telle idolatrie, qui serait préférable à l'athéisme, et telle autre qui serait pire. Ainsi, je ne puis répondre ni oui, ni non, à la question générale de M. Bayle. En second lieu, quand il s'agirait de considérer, non les opinions en général, mais les sociétés en elles-mêmes, qui feraient profession de l'idolatrie Payenne, ou de l'athéisme; il faudroit encore faire de grandes distinctions, et diviser la question en plusieurs propositions, selon les différens cas que l'on poseroit, et auxquels on répondrait négativement, ou affirmativement, suivant leur diversité. Je n'ai ni le loisir, ni la volonté de m'appliquer à cette sorte de recherche, et je n'en aurais même rien dit, si M. Bayle ne m'avait fait l'honneur de me citer, entre ceux qu'il croit être de son sentiment, dans l'Article lxxvii. de la *Continuation des Pensées diverses sur les Comètes*.—*Le Clerc*, Bibl. Chois. v. 302.

Si ce qu'on nous dit des opinions, des lois, et des mœurs des sujets des Yncas est

Bayle, after having showed us the worst side of Paganism, proceeds to insult Christianity, and to tell us that a nation consisting of true Christians must soon perish, and could not maintain itself against its irreligious neighbours; which doctrine is also retailed in that flagitious and detestable book, called *The Fable of the Bees*. And how does this appear? Is it because Christianity makes a man a poltroon? He does not pretend to say that: but because, according to the Gospel, self-defence is unlawful, stratagems in war are crimes, merchandising is wickedness, and riches and honours are prohibited. They who talk thus show that they understand not, or will not understand, either the strong and figurative style of the Scriptures, or the rational methods of interpreting them, or the true nature of virtues and vices. If this author proposed to himself to acquire the applause of Free-thinkers, he had his reward: but when Phocion had made a speech which was applauded by the populace, he asked, *Have I not said some foolish thing?*

To return to Divination. It appears from the Scriptures, that some good and great men, when they were taking leave of the world, and blessing their children or their nation, were enlightened with a prophetic spirit. Homer makes his heroes, as Patroclus and Hector, prophesy at the time of their death; and Cicero introduces his brother thus arguing in behalf of

vrai, il n'y a point eu d'empire idolatrie dans les autres parties du monde, sans en excepter ceux des nations les plus polies et les plus savantes, où il y ait eu de si bonnes lois, et où elles aient été si bien observées. La religion, qui consistoit principalement à adorer et à sacrifier au Soleil, non des victimes humaines, mais des bêtes et d'autres choses, a été la moins gâtée, qu'il y ait eu parmi les idolâtres. Outre le Soleil, ils disaient qu'il y avait une autre divinité. Ils parlaient de ce Dieu comme d'un être invisible, dont la nature leur était inconnue, et qui avait créé le soleil même et les étoiles. Ils croyaient aussi l'immortalité de l'âme, et avaient même une idée confuse de la résurrection, à ce que dit Garcilasso de la Vega. Supposé que ce qu'il dit soit véritable, on peut dire qu'une société idolâtre comme celle-là était incomparablement meilleure que ne le serait une société d'athées. Ceux qui n'ont pas encore lu cette histoire seront charmés de l'excellente police des Peruviens, de la charité qu'ils avaient pour les pauvres, les veuves, et les orphelins, et de l'innocence de leurs mœurs, à les considérer comme des peuples destitués des lumières de la Revelation. Il y aura même bien des gens, qui seront plus édifiés des vertus morales des Americains, destitués des lumières du ciel, que des vertus theologiques des Espagnols, qui sont, comme ils le croient, les meilleurs Chrétiens du monde.—

Le Clerc, Bibl. Chois. v. p. 380.

divination: *Epicurum ergo antepones Platoni et Socrati, qui ut rationem non redderent, auctoritate tamen hos minutos philosophos vincerent? Jubet igitur Plato sic ad somnum proficisci corporibus affectis, ut nihil sit, quod errorem animis perturbationemque afferat. Quum ergo est somno sevocatus animus a societate et a contagione corporis, tum meminit præteritorum, præsentia cernit, futura prævidet: jacet enim corpus, viget animus: quod multo magis faciet post mortem; itaque appropinquante morte multo est divinior. Divinare autem morientes, etiam illo exemplo confirmat Posidonius: idque facilius eveniet appropinquante morte, ut animi futura augurentur. Ex quo et illud est Calani, de quo ante dixi, et Homericæ Hectoris, qui moriens propinquam Achilli mortem denuntiat.⁸ The Pagans had also an opinion that the good wishes and the imprecations of parents were often fulfilled, and had in them a kind of divination. Read the story of Phoenix in Homer.⁹ And Plato says that every wise person revered and esteemed the prayers of his parents, knowing that they were very frequently accomplished. Πᾶς δὲ νοῦν ἔχων φοβεῖται καὶ τιμᾷ γονέων εὐχὰς, εἰδὼς πολλοῖς καὶ πολλάκις ἐπιτελεῖς γενομένας.¹*

Eusebius has treated the subject of *Oracles* in his *Præparatio Evangelica*². He produces such arguments as tend to show that it was all human fraud; and, amongst other things, he informs us that many pagan priests and prophets, who (under Constantine, I suppose) had been taken up, and tried, and tortured, had confessed that the Oracles were impostures, and had laid open the whole contrivance; and that their confessions stood upon record; and that these were not obscure wretches, but philosophers and magistrates, who had enriched themselves by persecuting and plundering the Christians. So Theodoret tells us that, in demolishing the temples at Alexandria, the Christians found hollow statues fixed to the walls, into which the priests used to enter, and thence deliver oracles.³ Eusebius adds, that the Peripatetics, Cynics, and Epicureans were of opinion that such predictions were all artifice and knavery. He then produces the

⁸ De Divin. i. 30.

⁹ Il. I. 445, &c.

¹ De Leg. xi. p. 931. Consult the place, and compare it with the case of Esau, in Gen. xxvii.

² L. iv. v. vi.

³ v. 22.

arguments of Diogenianus against divination. But Eusebius, as also all the ancient Christians, was of opinion that with these human frauds there might have been sometimes a mixture of demoniacal tricks⁴. He then argues against the oracles from the concessions and the writings of Pagans. He shows from Porphyry, that, according to that philosopher's own principles, and according to the reasonings of other Pagans, the gods who delivered oracles must have been evil demons. He proves the same thing from human sacrifices, and produces Porphyry's testimony and opinion that the Pagans worshipped evil demons, the chief of whom were *Serapis* and *Hecate*. He proves the same from Plutarch; and he gives a collection made by Cœno-maus of wicked, false, trifling, and ambiguous oracles.

The old Oracles often begin with 'Αλλ' ὅταν, *but when*, which is an odd setting out. Thus, in Herod. i. 55, 'Αλλ' ὅταν ἡμίονος; iii. 57, 'Αλλ' ὅταν ἐν Σίφνῳ; vi. 77, 'Αλλ' ὅταν ἡ θήλεια; viii. 77, 'Αλλ' ὅταν Ἀρτέμιδος. In the *Oracula Vetera*, 'Αλλ' οἱ μὲν καθύπερθε; 'Αλλὰ τέλει ξόανον; 'Αλλ' ὅποταν σκήπτροισι; 'Αλλ' ὅτε δὴ νύμφαι; 'Αλλ' ὅποταν Τιθορεὺς; 'Αλλ' ὅταν οἰκήσωσι. In imitation of which style, we find in the Sibylline Oracles, and in the beginning of a sentence, 'Αλλ' ὅποταν μέγαλοιο Θεοῦ κ. τ. λ. And so in many places of that collection, which I shall not transcribe. Hence Aristophanes, in banter, I suppose, of the predictions in Herodotus, makes a pompous and ridiculous oracle, and uses the same foolish introduction, to persuade a Sausage-monger to set up for a demagogue and a ruler. The oracle is in Heroic verse, and runs thus:

'Αλλ' ὅποταν μάρψῃ βυρσαίετος ἀγκυλοχείλης
Γαμφηλῆσι δράκοντα κοάλεμον, αἵματοπώτην,
Νῆ τότε Παφλαγόνων μὲν ἀπόλλυται ἡ σκοροδάλμη,
Κοιλιοπώλῃσιν δὲ θεὸς μέγα κῦδος ὑπάξει,
Αἶκεν μὴ πωλεῖν ἀλλᾶντας μᾶλλον ἔλωνται.⁵

Lucian also, *De Morte Peregrini*, gives us two oracles made upon the death of that knave, who burnt himself publicly; the one by a seeming friend, the other by a foe. The first was

⁴ *Pr. Ev.* vii. 16.

⁵ But when the Tanner-Eagle with a crooked beak shall seize the stupid blood-drinking Dragon, then the Paphlagonian pickle shall perish, and the Deity shall advance the sausage-mongers to the highest honours, if they will but leave off their trade, and sell no more puddings. (*Equit.* 197.)

ascribed to the *Sibyl*, who was the *Mother Shipton* of the ancients :

'ΑΛΛ' ὁπότεν Πρωτεύς, Κυνικῶν ὕχ' ἄριστος ἀπάντων,
Ζηνὸς ἐριγδούπου τέμενος κατὰ πῦρ ἀνακαύσας
'Ες φλόγα πηδήσας ἔλθῃ εἰς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον,
Δὴ τότε πάντας ὁμῶς, οἱ ἀρούρης καρπὸν ἔδουσι,
Νυκτιπόλον τιμᾶν κέλομαι Ἥρωα μέγιστον,
Σύνθρονον Ἥφαίστῳ καὶ Ἡρακλῆϊ ἀνακτι.⁶

The second was fathered upon *Bacis*, the *Nostradamus* of his times :

'ΑΛΛ' ὁπότεν Κυνικὸς πολυώνυμος ἐς φλόγα πολλὴν
Πηδήσῃ, δόξης ὑπ' ἐριννύϊ θυμὸν ὀρινθεῖς,
Δὴ τότε τοὺς ἄλλους κυναλώπεκας, οἳ οἱ ἔπονται,
Μιμεῖσθαι χρὴ πότμον ἀποιχομένοιο λύκοιο.
'Ὅς δέ κε, δειλὸς ἔων, φεύγει μένος Ἥφαίστοιο,
Λάεσσιν βαλέειν τοῦτον τάχα πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς,
'Ὡς μὴ ψυχρὸς ἔων θερμηγορέειν ἐπιχειρῇ,
Χρυσῷ σαξάμενος πῆρην, μάλα πολλὰ δανείζων,
'Εν καλαῖς Πάτραισιν ἔχων τρεῖς πέντε τάλαντα.⁷

It is probable that Lucian made both these oracles, to divert himself and his readers, not forgetting the essential 'ΑΛΛ' ὅταν. But Lucian's raillery could not put a stop to the superstition of the world ; for this Peregrinus, or Proteus, was deified, and had, at Parium, a statue erected, to which religious honours were paid, and which delivered oracles.⁸

The comedy of Aristophanes, cited above, abounds with ridicule upon the oracles, and shows the liberty which the wits in his days took to deride them, and to bring them into contempt.

If the writer *de Dea Syria* be in earnest, and sincere in his narration, as he seems to be, there were few pagan temples and oracles more remarkable than that of Hierapolis in Syria ; and from his account it may be inferred that the priests of that

⁶ But when Proteus, the chief of the Cynics, having set on fire the sacred precincts of the thundering Jupiter, leaping into the flames, shall ascend up to Olympus, then let all mortals with one consent adore the nocturnal hero, and rank him with Vulcan and Hercules.

⁷ But when the Cynic, who has more names than one, incited by the Furies, and by the mad love of vainglory, shall jump into the flames, then let all the Dog-foxes, his trusty disciples, follow the example of the departed Wolf. And if any one of them shrink, and be afraid of the fire, let all the Greeks pelt him with stones, that he may no more show his courage only by prating, and put gold into his satchel, and lend it out to interest, and add to the fifteen talents which he has hoarded up at Patræ.

⁸ See Athenagoras, *Legat.*

temple had carried the arts of imposture to great perfection, and surpassed their ancient instructors the Egyptians, like the thief who stole a statue of Mercury, and told the god, Πολλοὶ μαθηταὶ κρείσσονες διδασκάλων. The Egyptians, says this author, were the first who had knowledge of the gods, and built them temples; and from them the Assyrians learned these things. Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus say the same⁹.

They had a statue of Apollo, differing from the Grecian images of that god in two things; he was represented with a beard, and he was clothed: and he delivered his oracles thus: Μαντήϊα πολλὰ μὲν παρ' Ἑλλησι, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοισι· τὰ δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ Λιβύῃ, καὶ ἐν τῇδε Ἀσίῃ πολλά ἐστι. Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν οὔτε ἱρέων ἄνευ οὔτε προφητέων φθέγγονται· ὅδε δὲ αὐτός τε κινέεται, καὶ τὸν μαντηῖν ἐς τέλος αὐτουργεῖ. Τρόπος δὲ αὐτῆς τοιόσδε. Εὖτ' ἂν ἐθέλῃσι χρησμηγορέειν, ἐν τῇ ἔδρῃ πρῶτα κινέεται, οἱ δὲ μιν ἱρέες αὐτίκα αείρουσι, ἣν δὲ μὴ αείρωσι, ὁ δὲ ἰδρώει, καὶ ἐς μέσον ἔτι κινέεται. Εὖτ' ἂν δὲ ὑποδύντες φέρωσι, ἄγει σφέας, πάντῃ περιδινέων, καὶ ἐς ἄλλον ἐξ ἑτέρου μεταπηδέων. Τέλος ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἀντιάσας, ἐπερέεταί μιν περὶ ἀπάντων πρηγμάτων· ὁ δὲ, ἣν τι μὴ θέλῃ ποιέεσθαι, ὀπίσω ἀναχωρεῖ· ἣν δὲ τι ἐπαινέῃ, ἄγει ἐς τὸ πρόσω τοὺς προσφέροντας, ὅκωσπερ ἡνιοχέων. Οὕτω μὲν συναγείρουσι τὰ θέσφατα, καὶ οὔτε ἱρὸν πρῆγμα οὐδὲν, οὔτε ἴδιον, τούτου ἄνευ ποιέουσι. Λέγει δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἔτεος πέρι, καὶ τῶν ὁρέων αὐτοῦ πασέων, καὶ ὁκότε οὐκ ἔσονται· λέγει δὲ καὶ τοῦ Σημηΐου πέρι, κότε χρή μιν ἀποδημέειν τὸν εἶπον ἀποδημίην. Ἐρέω δὲ καὶ ἄλλο τὸ ἐμεῦ παρεόντος ἔπρηξε. Οἱ μὲν μιν ἱρέες αείροντες ἔφερον, ὁ δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἐν γῇ κάτω ἔλιπε, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐν τῷ ἡέρι μούνος ἐφορέετο.¹

This author says here that he saw the image suspended and moving along in the air, upon which La Croze and Guetus observe that he is a liar². They did not consider that feats as surprising as this have been performed by machinery assisted with legerdemain, and that christian monks, and well as pagan priests, have been eminent in such arts. We are obliged to the

⁹ Lucian de Dea Syr. § 2. Καὶ θεοὶ δὲ κάρτα αὐτοῖσι ἐμφανέες· ἰδρώει γὰρ δὴ ὦν παρὰ σφίσι τὰ ξόανα, καὶ κινέεται, καὶ χρησμηγορεῖ· καὶ βοή δὲ πολλάκις ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ νηφῷ, κλεισθέντος τοῦ ἱροῦ, καὶ πολλοὶ ἤκουσαν.

¹ Ib. § 36, 37.

² Cicero mentions the old story of the wooden *lituus* of Romulus, which was not consumed in a fire, and treats it as a fable (*De Divin.* ii. 38): and yet it might possibly be true; for incombustible wood has been discovered.

writer for not omitting a remarkable circumstance, that the image was adorned with a fine robe. The cloak was not put on for nothing, and served in all probability to conceal some knavery.

The tricks of the Egyptian priests were not to be compared to this. Their little gods, when they were carried in procession, did not sweat, like these statues, but only made the porters sweat :

— sic numina Memphis

In vulgus proferre solet : penetralibus exit
Effigies ; brevis illa quidem : sed plurimus infra
Liniger imposito suspirat vecte sacerdos,
Testatus sudore Deum.³

Observe that this statue did not speak, and that when the writer says λέγει ἑτέος περί, he only means that it *indicated* or *declared*. From his account we may collect that when any question was put to it, if it retired and drew back, that was as much as to say, *No* : if it advanced, the meaning was, *Yes*.

We have accounts very like this, from other authors, of other statues and oracles. Diodorus Siculus says of Jupiter Ammon : Τὸ δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ξόανον τὴν μαντείαν ἰδιάζουσιν παντελῶς ποιῆται. Ἐπὶ νεῶς γὰρ περιφέρεται χρυσῆς ὑπὸ ἱερέων ὀγδοήκοντα οὔτοι δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων φέροντες τὸν θεόν, προάγουσιν αὐτομάτως ὅπου πότε ἂν ἄγοι τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ νεῦμα τὴν πορείαν.⁴ Macrobius⁵ says, *Hujus [Heliopolitani] templi religio etiam divinatione præpollet, quæ ad Apollinis potestatem refertur, qui idem atque Sol est. Vehitur enim simulacrum Dei Heliopolitani ferculo ; et subeunt plerumque provinciæ procures, raso capite, longi temporis castimonia pura ; ferunturque divino spiritu, non suo arbitrio, sed quo Deus propellit vehentes : ut videmus apud Antium promoveri simulacra Fortunarum ad danda responsa.* Strabo says from Callisthenes, that Ammon delivered his answers, οὐ διὰ λόγων, ἀλλὰ νεύμασι καὶ συμβόλοις τὸ πλεόν.⁶

The writer *de Dea Syria* tells us that the beasts which were kept in this sacred place lost their natural fierceness. Ἐν δὲ τῇ αὐλῇ ἄφετοι νέμονται βόες μεγάλοι, καὶ ἵπποι, καὶ ἄετοι, καὶ ἄρκτοι,

³ Claudian iv. *Cons. Hon.* 569.

⁴ Diod. S. xvii. Compare with this Q. *Curtius* iv. 7.

⁵ i. 23.

⁶ See Van Dale (*De Orac.* p. 210); who produces these passages of Diodorus, Macrobius, and Strabo, and adds some from other authors.

καὶ λέοντες, καὶ ἀνθρώπους οὐδαμᾶ σίνονται, ἀλλὰ πάντες ἱροί τε εἰσι, καὶ χειροήθεις.⁷ The city and temple also, as he informs us, swarmed with *Galli*, or *castrated priests*, who perhaps performed the same operation upon these wild beasts, which they had performed upon themselves; and this, together with due correction administered from time to time, and a good education, and seeing much company, and proper food, and a full belly, and three meals a day, would make these lions and bears as tame as lambs. The μεγάλοι βόες were probably *oxen*, who grow to a much larger size than bulls; and a bull is a surly animal, with whom it is hard to cultivate any friendship.

Van Dale observes from Theophrastus, that cedar, and those sorts of wood which contain an oily moisture, will have a dew upon them in damp weather, and that statues made of them will sweat, which passed for a prodigy with silly people. He mentions this, as illustrating what is said in the book *De Dea Syria* concerning sweating images; but I rather think that the priests there had some surer contrivance to bring about this miracle, and could make their images sweat when they thought proper.

The book *De Dea Syria* is very entertaining, and composed elegantly, and in the Ionic dialect. The author seems to have been a Pagan who gave credit to prodigies, oracles, and the power of the Gods, which was not Lucian's case. If Lucian wrote it, to whom it is ascribed, one might suspect that as he proposed to follow Herodotus in style and manner, so he affected to imitate him in gravely relating marvellous and strange things. But if this were his design, it was of too refined a nature, and by the seriousness which runs through the whole composition, the jest has been hitherto lost. Lucian⁸ banters Herodotus as a liar, though unjustly, I think; for in this charming historian there are some marks of credulity, but none of dishonesty. Whosoever made the book, and with whatsoever intent, his narration seems to be historically true, and much of it is confirmed by other writers. We are informed by Fabricius⁹ that Jurieu, in his *History of the Jewish Rites and Doctrines*, has concluded that Lucian was not the author of this Treatise, because it is written in the Ionic dialect. The argument proves nothing, for Lucian was an ingenious monkey, who could imitate

⁷ § 41.⁸ *Ver. Hist.* ii. 31.⁹ *Bibl. Gr.* iii. 501.

what he would, and throw himself into all shapes; and he might affect this sweetly-flowing style, for several reasons, or out of mere fancy; and Arrian, as Fabricius observes, wrote his *Indica* in this dialect, though he composed his other works in the Attic diction. I have not Jurieu's book to consult, and perhaps it is not worth the seeking. Jurieu made a figure in his time, and had more zeal than discretion. He wrote some tracts of devotion, and he was remarkable for two things; first, for misinterpreting the Apocalypse, and thence foretelling what never came to pass; secondly, for publishing idle stories against Grotius, and other learned men, in a book called *L'Esprit de Monsieur Arnauld*. The book at first had a run, for censure is of a healthy complexion, and thrives better than panegyric; and as it has been said of a hog¹, that his soul is given him instead of salt, to keep him from stinking, so what is called *Secret History* will preserve even a slovenly performance from decaying, longer than one would imagine; but now this work would be little known, if Bayle and Le Clerc and others had not chastised it, in which perhaps they did it too much honour. Jurieu by treating Grotius as an infidel, went to work like a bungler; for, *Est ars etiam maledicendi*, as Joseph Scaliger said upon a like occasion, and it requires something of a hand to throw dirt. Bossuet, though he did not fight with such weapons as Jurieu, yet attacked Grotius, as a dangerous author and a Socinian; and made remarks upon him which are mere declamation and *verbiage*. It is one thing to be *Bishop of Meaux*, and another thing to be *Hugo Grotius*: Οὐ γὰρ ἐν μέσοισι κείται Δῶρα δυσμαχητὰ Μοισᾶν Τῶπιτυχόντι φέρειν. Calmet, if I remember right, has also treated Grotius in the same manner. Grotius was inclined to think and to judge rather too favourably, than too hardly of the church of Rome; for which some of the ecclesiastics of that communion have repaid him with the gratitude that was to be expected, and have taught by-standers, that he who endeavours to stroke a tiger into good humour, will at least have his fingers bitten off in the experiment.

Herodotus is of opinion that divination and oracles had their rise in Egypt, and thence came into Africa and Greece, and that the oracle at Dodona was the most ancient in Greece.² The

¹ Cicero *De Nat. Deor.* ii. 64.

² L. ii.

opinion is very probable, for Egypt was the nursery of idolatry and superstition. Homer mentions the temple of Jupiter at Dodona, and that of Apollo at Pytho, or Delphi, as being illustrious in the time of the Trojan war, and represents the latter as immensely rich.³

Herodotus shows us the great authority of oracles, from ancient times down to his own, by which kingdoms were disposed of, and war and peace were made. He relates that the Heraclidæ, who, before Gyges, reigned in Lydia, at Sardes, obtained the kingdom by an oracle; and that Gyges, who slew his master Candaules, had the kingdom adjudged to him by the Delphic oracle, which favour he rewarded by sending thither large gifts. Herodotus everywhere speaks of oracles, divination, and prodigies, as one who firmly believed in them, and who was displeased with those that slighted them.⁴

³ Il. I. 404. Il. 233.

⁴ See viii. 77. He gives us there an oracle of Bacis, in which there is a remarkable expression, and in the style of the Scriptures:—Δῖα δίκη σβέσσει κρατερὸν κόρον, ὕβριος υἷον. Thus *Psalms* lxxxix. 22, *Nor the son of wickedness afflict him.* 2 *Sam.* vii. 10, *Neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them.* Judas is called *the son of perdition*, John xvii. 12, where see Grotius. The oracle is this:—

Ἄλλ' ὅταν Ἀρτέμιδος χρυσάορον ἱερὸν ἀκτὴν
 Νηυσὶ γεφυρώσωσι, καὶ εἰναλίην Κυνόσουραν,
 Ἐλπίδι μαινομένη λιπαρὰς πέρσαντες Ἀθήνας,
 Δῖα δίκη σβέσσει κρατερὸν κόρον, ὕβριος υἷον,
 Δεινὸν μαιμώνοντα, δοκεῖντ' ἀνὰ πάντα πυθέσθαι.
 Χαλκὸς γὰρ χαλκῷ συμμίζεται, αἵματι δ' Ἄρης
 Πόντον φοινίξει· τότε ἐλεύθερον Ἑλλάδος ἦμαρ
 Εὐρύπα Κρονίδης ἐπάγει, καὶ πότνια Νίκη.

It was supposed to have been delivered by *Bacis*, before the battle of Salamis; and to have been fulfilled in the signal victory which the Greeks then obtained over *Xerxes*. I have received the following observation upon it:—

Give me leave to propose to you this question, whether κρατερὸν κόρον ὕβριος υἷον be rightly translated Juvenem superbum? I apprehend that Gronovius has mistaken the word κόρον, which signifies here not juvenem, but fastum, or insolentiam. My reason for this opinion is, that I find Pindar uses the word in this sense (Olymp. xiii. 12); where also he gives Insolence the same parentage which the oracle attributes to it; viz. Pride, ὕβριν. His words are these:—Speaking of the social virtues that dwell at Corinth, he says,

Ἐθέλοντι δ' ἀλεξεῖν ὕβριν κόρου
 Ματέρα θρασύμυθον,

where it seems necessary that κόρος must signify Insolence, or some such concomitant of

Tiresias had an oracle at Orchomenus, which having been famous for some ages, was silent after a plague that had raged in

pride. In Olymp. A. 89, κόρῳ δ' ἔλεν, κ. τ. λ., the Scholiast says, κόρῳ, τῇ ὕβρει καὶ ἀλαζονείᾳ. The words that follow indeed show that it was a metaphorical sense in which the word is here used, in the opinion of the Scholiast: but this is not the case in Olymp. xiii., nor is it the case in Olymp. ii., αἶνον ἔβα κόρος, which is thus explained: τὸν ἐπαινὸν, τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θήρωνος, κόρος δὲ ὕβρις. The Scholiast here plainly takes κόρος to signify pride, or some of its malignant attendants. And as from these passages it seems that the word may have the meaning of insolence, so I fancy you will not think it an inconvenient sense in the oracle cited. The insolence of the Persians, confident in their immense superiority, in the number of their troops, and spreading desolation in their march, is nobly painted in the verses following that which you have quoted; and this insolence seems a very fit object of Divine punishment. I need not add, that, if this interpretation be the true one, the expression is not in the Oriental manner, but entirely Grecian.

The sameness of expression in Pindar and in the oracle is very well observed by this gentleman; and these two writers were contemporaries: but the passage in Pindar (Olymp. xiii.) is obscure, and has perplexed his commentators.

Abundance begets insolence: so says Theognis, and so says all the world;

Τίττει τοι κόρος ὕβριν, ὅταν κακῶ ὄλβος ἔποιτο.

But Pindar, if the passage be not corrupted, inverts the proverb, and says ὕβρις τίττει κόρον.

Ἐθέλοντι δ' ἀλεξεῖν ὕβριν, κόρου

Ματέρα θρασύμυθον.

The Scholiast censures the bold poet, for the impropriety of the expression; for putting the cart before the horse. H. Stephens, for κόρου conjectures φθόρου. The Oxford editor retains κόρου, and admits the *hypallage*, and construes it backwards. If it be supposed that κόρος here is *insolence*, it is hard to conceive how ὕβρις can produce it; because there is too much identity between κόρος and ὕβρις.

Pindar often uses the word κόρος, commonly in the sense of *nimia satietas*, and *saturitas*; and of *dislike* and *loathing*; and sometimes for *insolence*, or *envy*. *Pyth.* i. 160. Ἀπὸ γὰρ κόρος ἀμβλύνει αἰανὴς ταχείας ἀπάδης. And so, *Nem.* x. 37. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ κόρος ἀνθρώπων βαρὺς ἀντιάσαι. And *Pyth.* viii. 43. μὴ κόρος ἐλθὼν Κνίσῃ. And *Nem.* vii. 77. κόρον δ' ἔχει καὶ μέλι. *Olymp.* ii. 173. Ἀλλ' αἶνον ἔβα κόρος. In this place κόρος may mean *envy*, excited by the glory and reputation of Theron, which was so great that his enemies could not bear it: and the word retains some idea of *over-abundance*. *Nem.* i. 97. σὺν πλαγίῳ Ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ στείχοντα. Here κόρος seems to mean *oppressive insolence*. *Olymp.* i. 89. κόρῳ δ' ἔλεν Ἄταν. Κόρῳ, that is, *πλησμονῇ*, as the Scholiast rightly interprets it. Too much affluence and prosperity ruined him. *Isthm.* iii. 4. κατέχει Φρασὶν αἰανὴ κόρον, i. e. *petulantiam ex satietate provenientem*. But, to come to the oracle, if we should suppose that κόρος there means *fulness*, or *insolence*, or *pride*; yet the author made a person of it, and by that person he meant Xerxes, as it appears, I think, from the fifth verse, Δεινὸν μαιμώνοντα, δοκεῖντ' ἀνὰ πάντα πυθέσθαι, which I translate, *Vehementur furentem, putantem se omnia rescivisse*; i. e. *imagining that he had good intelligence, and knew all that passed amongst the Greeks*. He alludes to the stratagem of Themistocles, who sent word to Xerxes that the Greeks were in confusion and preparing to run

that town. It is highly probable, as Bayle observes, that the distemper swept away all the priests, and that none was left to conduct the affair, and to forge responses.⁶ As to the evil demons, it is to be supposed that the plague did not destroy them, and that they were as capable of prophesying after, as before it.

Herodotus also relates prophetic dreams which were said to have been accomplished, as the dream of Croesus, of Astyages, and of others. *Having travelled, says Prideaux,⁷ through Egypt, Syria, and several other countries, in order to the writing of his history, he did, as travellers used to do: he put down relations upon trust, as he met with them, and no doubt was imposed upon in many of them.*

Van Dale, in his book *De Oraculis*, observes that the oracular temples were usually situated in mountainous places, which abounded with caverns fitted for frauds:—that the oracles were delivered only at stated times:—that, at Delphi, the priestess had priests, prophets, and poets, to take down and explain and mend her gibberish; which served to justify Apollo from the imputation of making bad verses, for if they were defective, the fault was laid upon the amanuensis:—that the consulters sometimes wrote their requests, and received answers in writing:—that the priests had the art of opening letters and closing them again, without breaking the seal:—that the *adyta*, whence the oracles were delivered, were shaded with branches, and clouded with incense, to help the fraud:—that in the temples sweet smells were suddenly diffused, to show that the god was in good humour:—that there are drugs, herbs, and fumigations which will make a man foam at the mouth, and be delirious, and that away, and advised him to seize the opportunity of inclosing and cutting them to pieces. By this trick the Athenian General, who had in him as much of the fox as of the lion, brought on a battle, which was what he wanted.

Who can tell whether the priest, who composed this oracle, might not use on purpose the ambiguous word *κόρος*, which may mean either *a young man*, or *fulness and satiety*, and so denote Xerxes, a young prince swelled with pride and glutted with ravage? Ambiguity suits an oracle, and a little jargon is not amiss.

The translator of Herodotus rendered *κόρον*, *juvenem*; and Gale and Gronovius let it stand, and adopted it: and if it means *a person*, the phrase *ὑβριος υἱόν* may be accounted oriental, and scriptural.

⁶ Bayle's Dict. in *Tiresias*.

⁷ Connexion, vol. 1, p. 112. Oxford ed.

the priestess might use such methods:^s—that it might also sometimes be grimace and artifice:—that the god sometimes gave answers himself, by a voice, or by the motion of his statue, &c.

This is what I had to offer concerning divination, and prophecy in general, the *Sibylline Oracles* excepted, which shall be examined apart.

VI. ON THE PROPHECIES RELATING TO CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY IN PARTICULAR.

The prophecies relating to our Saviour, and to Christianity, have some of them a mixture of obscurity; and the interpretations which have been given of them are various; but this ought to be matter neither of wonder, nor of offence, because in the nature of things it cannot be otherwise.⁹

^s “Father *Ange de S. Joseph*, a Carmelite and missionary in the Levant, relates that a person worthy of credit, having taken a pill of Persian opium, was forced for many hours to laugh and talk nonsense, in spite of himself. He saw little phantasms pass before his eyes, and goblins who made a very grotesque appearance, and felt several other extraordinary effects, without any bad consequence. This example shows how certain compositions can operate upon the imagination and the senses. The Father does not care to say that himself was the person to whom this happened; but Chardin attests it in his *Voyages*.”—Beausobre’s *Hist. of the Manichees*, T. I. p. 186.

⁹ It were indeed to be wondered, if obscurity should not lie upon some of the prophecies, the latest whereof was written at the distance of above two thousand years ago. Prophetic writings, besides what is common to them with other writings, to grow dark with age, have something peculiar in their nature to render them less intelligible. Prophecies, remote from the time of their accomplishment, and whose completion depends on the concurrence of free agents, are not wont to be delivered very distinctly at first. The obscurity becomes greater, from the language wherein they are written. The Hebrew, as other Eastern languages, is entirely different from the European. Many things are there left to be supplied by the quickness of the reader’s apprehension, which are with us expressed by proper words and repetitions. Particles disjunctive and adversative, significative marks of connection, and of transition from one subject to another, are often omitted here. Dialogues are carried on, objections answered, comparisons made, without notice in the discourse; and through frequent change of persons, tenses, and numbers, we are left to guess who are the persons spoken of, which gave no difficulty to them whose living language it was. The prophetic style is of all other the most copious this way. It seems to be a sort of language by itself. It ties itself to no order or method, but passes from one subject to another insensibly, and suddenly resumes it again, and often sallies out to the main thing that was intended in the prophet’s thoughts.

That Jesus was the Messiah foretold by the prophets, appears thus:—

The prophets speak of a new and second covenant, which God

The prophets used to act part of what they were to foretel. Those actions supplying the place of words, and being not expressed in the writing, a sort of chasm is sometimes to be discerned in them; as at other times, different discourses or addresses, distinguishable in the speaking by proper signs and motions, seem now to be connected, though they have no relation to each other. What increases the difficulty, is the little or no order that the collectors have placed the prophecies in, according to the usage of the ancients, who joined together writings upon different occasions, of the same authors, and sometimes of different authors, as if they made but one continued discourse. The mistake might have been in some measure prevented, had the books written by the Jews, after their return from the Babylonian captivity, remained to our days. But these helps fail us, and not one book writ in the Hebrew tongue, since prophecy ceased, hath escaped the general calamity that hath befallen the Jewish writings.—Bp. Chandler, *Introd. to Defence of Christianity*.

Oratio Jesaiæ sic est constructa, ut de illius arte, elegantia, *ἐνεργεία*, pondere, nihil tam magnificum cogitari ac dici possit, quin sit infra ejus meritum. Sed id ipsum est, quod interpretem multis in locis impedit, ejusque, studiosi etiam et bonis subsidiis instructi, diligentiam ac judicium valde exercet. Imo vero censeo nullius mortalis, licet in Hebræis literis docte versati, tantum esse acumen, peritiam, perspicaciam, ut prophetæ nostro longe pluribus locis reddere potuerit genuinum suum sensum, nisi lectio antiqua synagogica per traditionem in scholis Hebræorum fuisset conservata, ut eam nunc Masoretharum punctulis expressam habemus.—Vitringa, *Præfat. ad Jesaiam*.

Il y a dans les Prophètes beaucoup de mots très-obscurs, qui pouvoient être clairs autrefois, que le langue Hebraïque étoit florissante. Il y a encore plus de passages, où la construction et la liaison du discours ne sont pas faciles à développer, et où l'on voit pas bien ce que les prophètes ont voulu dire. Les allusions fréquentes à des choses qui nous sont inconnues, soit à l'égard des Juifs, soit à l'égard de la plûpart des peuples voisins, dont il nous reste aucuns monumens, ne servent pas peu à embarrasser les interprètes.—Le Clerc, *Bibl. Chois.* xxvii. 381.

Nos sane suas elegantias esse Hebræorum linguæ, quemadmodum ceteris omnibus, non negamus; sed cum cultis et copiosis linguis conferendam esse non putamus. Monendus tamen est lector eam a nobis spectari, non qualis olim dum florebat fortasse fuit, sed qualis superest in Libris Sacris, quibus omnes ejus reliquiæ continentur. Multo quidem plura vocabula pluresque phrases in usu fuisse, quam quæ in modico volumine leguntur, non ægre fatemur. Sed quoad potest ex ejus reliquiis judicium ferri, inopem eam, ambiguam, et parum cultam fuisse existimamus, quod jam ostendere aggrediemur. Linguarum omnium laudes in tribus potissimum rebus sitæ sunt, in copia vocabulorum et phrasium, in perspicuitate orationis, ejusque elegantia, cujus a rhetoribus canones describuntur; quibus rebus multo Hebraicæ superiores sunt multæ linguæ, et Græca quidem præ ceteris; nec quasi pulcherrimam jactari Hebraicam posse, manifestum est, &c., &c.—Le Clerc, *Proleg. ad V. T. Diss.* i.

Such are the difficulties which attend the interpretation of the prophecies, and which I have chosen to represent in the words of competent judges.

would make with his people. They mention, not once or twice, but very often, the conversion of the Gentiles from superstition and idolatry to the worship of the true God; they speak of four successive empires; the last of which was the Roman empire; and under this last empire they say that a new and everlasting kingdom shall be established by one to whom God should give absolute power and dominion. A great person was to come, who should be *Emmanuel*, or, *God with us*; the son of God, and the son of man; of the seed of Abraham, of Isaac, and of David; born of a virgin; poor and obscure, and yet one whom David calls his Lord; the Lord to whom the temple belonged, the mighty God, a great king, an everlasting priest, though not of the tribe of Levi; born at Bethlehem, a prophet like unto Moses, but greater than Moses; a prophet who should preach to the poor and meek, and proclaim liberty to the captives, and comfort the mourners, and heal the broken-hearted; who should proclaim his gospel first and principally in the land of Zebulon and Naphthali, in Galilee of the Gentiles; who should have a forerunner in the spirit of Elias, crying in the wilderness, *Prepare ye the way of the Lord*; who should instruct in a mild and peaceable manner, without wrath and contention, before the destruction of the Temple, in which Temple he should be seen and heard; who should enter into Jerusalem meek and humble, and riding on an ass; who should work miracles more than Moses and all the prophets, and miracles of the merciful and beneficent kind, open the eyes of the blind, and the ears of the deaf, and make the dumb to praise God, and the lame to leap like a hart; who, notwithstanding all his power and goodness, should be rejected by the greater part of the nation, to whom he should be a stumbling block; who should be despised and afflicted, a man of sorrow, and cut off from the land of the living; who should have enemies numerous, powerful, crafty, and wicked; who should be accused by false witnesses, betrayed by an intimate and particular friend, sold for thirty pieces of silver, and the money given for a potter's field, when it had been flung away by the traitor, who should not live long after his crime, and whose office should be filled up by another; that his enemies should use him contumeliously, buffet him, and spit upon him, whilst he should be led like a lamb to the slaughter,

not opening his mouth, and uttering nothing, except intercessions for the transgressors; that his enemies should strip him of his raiment, divide it amongst themselves, and cast lots upon it, surround him, pierce his hands and his feet, mock him, and shake their heads at him, give him gall to eat, and vinegar to drink; that he should be reduced to so weak and languishing a condition that his bones might all be counted, his heart should melt within him, and his tongue cleave to the roof of his mouth; that he should be brought to the dust of death; that he should be pierced, and yet not one of his bones be broken; that he should be laid in the sepulchre of a rich and honourable man, none of his enemies hindering it; that he should rise again before he had seen corruption, and subdue his enemies, and ascend into heaven, and sit at God's right hand, and be crowned with honour and glory, and see his seed and prosper, and justify many, and be adored by kings and princes; that then Jerusalem should be made desolate, and the Jews dispersed in all lands; and the Gentiles should be converted and flow into the church. These things were said concerning some person; and they are all applicable to Christ.

God foretold by his prophets in a clear and exact manner many great changes and revolutions, many things relating to the fates and fortunes of the Jews, and of the neighbouring nations with whom they were concerned. The only possible objection which can be made to these predictions, is, that perhaps they were written after the event. I shall therefore mention a few, out of several, which cannot be suspected of such a forgery.

⁹Ezekiel thus prophesies concerning Egypt:—*Egypt shall be the basest of the kingdoms, neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations: for I will diminish them, that they shall no more rule over the nations.*¹ Egypt was attacked and oppressed by the Persians, by Cambyzes, by Xerxes, by Darius Nothus, and conquered by Ochus three hundred and fifty years before Christ, and from that time to this day the Egyptians never had an Egyptian king, but have been under the government of the Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Saracens, and Turks. Eusebius

⁹ Isaiah prophesied more than 700, Jeremiah more than 600, and Ezekiel almost 600 years before Christ.

¹ Ezek. xxix. 15.

was mistaken in dating the subjection of Egypt to a foreign power from the victory of Augustus at Actium, and the death of Antony and Cleopatra.²

Concerning Babylon it was foretold:—*The wild beasts of the desert—shall dwell there, and the owls shall dwell therein: and it shall be no more inhabited for ever: neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation. As God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, and the neighbour cities thereof—so no man shall dwell there, neither shall any son of man dwell therein.—They shall not take of thee a stone for a corner, nor a stone for foundations; but thou shalt be desolate for ever, saith the Lord.—Babylon shall become heaps, a dwelling place for dragons, an astonishment and an hissing, without an inhabitant.—When thou hast made an end of reading this book, thou shalt bind a stone to it, and cast it into the midst of Euphrates. And thou shalt say, Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her.—Babylon, the glory of kingdoms—shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation: neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there, neither shall the shepherds make their fold there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there, and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures, and owls shall dwell there,—and dragons in their pleasant places.*³ Seleucus built Seleucia (B. C. 293), which completed the ruin and desolation of Babylon;—a desolation that continues to this day.⁴

Concerning Tyre it was prophesied:—*I will make thee like the top of a rock; Thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon; thou shalt be built no more;—thou shalt be a terror, and never shalt be any more.*⁵ Old Tyre and new Tyre are no more, and only exist in history.⁶

² Euseb. *Dem. Evang.* vi. p. 299.

³ Jer. l. 39, li. 26, 37, 64; Isai. xiii. 19.

⁴ Prideaux *Connect.* P. I. B. viii., and Vitringa on Isai. xiii.

⁵ Ezek. xxvi. 14, 21, xxvii. 36, xxviii. 19.

⁶ Tyrus insularis—tandem pervenit ad eum statum, quo hodie deprehenditur, ut in ipsa Tyro quoque itinerator Tyrum quærat et non agnoscat; perinde ut res se habuit cum Babylone. Qui articuli imminutionis Tyri, et varia ejus fata a me ex historia demonstrari possent, si vere cum Marshamo aliisque mihi non persuaderem, vaticinium hoc Ezechielis intelligendum esse de *Tyro vetere*, urbe olim multo majore et potentiore quam fuit *Tyrus nova insularis*, licet ea ipsi accensita fuerit; quæ

In *Genesis*⁷ the angel said to Hagar—*Thou shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael;—And he will be a wild man* [as savage as a wild ass]; *his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him: and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren.* Ishmael was the father of the Arabs, who are, and ever have been, such as Ishmael is here described, robbers, freebooters, and independent vagabonds.

In the same book⁸ Isaac says to his son Esau, *by thy sword shalt thou live.* Esau was the father of the Idumæans, who were always a warlike people, ravaging their neighbours, and of a restless disposition. Such they were in the days of Josephus, who gives them this character: *Θορυβῶδες καὶ ἄτακτον ἔθνος, ἀεί τε μετέωρον πρὸς τὰ κινήματα, καὶ μεταβολαῖς χαῖρον, πρὸς ὀλίγην δὲ κολακείαν τῶν δεομένων τὰ ὄπλα κινουῦν, καὶ, καθάπερ εἰς ἑορτὴν, εἰς τὰς παρατάξεις ἐπειγόμενον.*⁹

The most extraordinary person who ever appeared amongst the Jews was Christ, who without human means, and with a few poor disciples, brought about a greater change, and accomplished a greater undertaking, than any Jew ever conceived and attempted. If he was the Messiah, it is reasonable to suppose that the prophets, who so accurately and undeniably foretold the things relating to Babylon, Tyre, &c., would give some indications of this sacred person, who was of more importance to the Jews and to mankind; and consequently it is reasonable to think that we rightly understand in general the prophecies

Tyrus insularis post hoc tempus sola culta est, et gloriam Tyri veteris sustinuit:—dum altera pars ejus, hoc est, Tyrus vetus, plane subverteretur, nunquam reædificanda, ab Alexandro dein plane diruta, qui ruderibus lapidibusque ejus usus est in Tyro insulari oppugnanda; ut adeo hodieque ejus Palætyri nihil amplius supersit, nec locus nisi ad signa veterum geographorum, eaque non satis certa, demonstrari possit.—Vitrunga ad Isai. xxiii. p. 708. See also Prideaux, *Connect.* P. I. B. 2 & 7.

The city of Tyre, standing in the sea upon a peninsula, promises at a distance something very magnificent. But when you come to it, you find no similitude of that glory for which it was so renowned in ancient times. On the north side it has an old Turkish ungarrisoned castle; besides which you see nothing here, but a mere Babel of broken walls, pillars, vaults, &c., there being not so much as one entire house left. Its present inhabitants are only a few poor wretches, harbouring themselves in the vaults, and subsisting chiefly upon fishing; who seem to be preserved in this place by Divine Providence, as a visible argument how God has fulfilled his word concerning Tyre, that it should be *as the top of a rock, a place for fishers to dry their nets on.*—Maundrel's *Journey*, p. 48.

⁷ Gen. xvi. 14, 15.

⁸ Gen. xxvii. 40.

⁹ B. J. iv. 4.

which are applied to him. If he falsely assumed the character which he took, yet since he had the art and the success to make many of the Jews, and a great part of the Gentile world believe in him, it was to be expected that some caution would have been given in the prophetic writings to the Jews, that they might not be misled by him, nor expect any prophet after Malachi.

Passages in the Old Testament which have been applied to him are of four sorts. I. Accommodations. II. Direct prophecies. III. Types. IV. Prophecies of double senses.

I. *Accommodations* are passages of the Old Testament, which are adapted by the writers of the New to something that happened in their time, because of some correspondence and similitude. These are no prophecies, though they be said sometimes to be *fulfilled*; for anything may be said to be *fulfilled*, when it can be pertinently applied. For example, St. Matthew says:—*All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world.*¹ The meaning is apparently no more than this, that what the Psalmist said of his way of teaching, might justly be said of those discourses of Christ. Thus the apostles frequently allude to the sacred books; and thus Pagan writers often cite passages from their old poets, to describe things² of which those poets never thought. This is no fault, but rather a beauty in writing; and a passage applied justly, and in a new sense, is ever pleasing to an ingenious reader, who loves to be agreeably surprised, and to see a likeness and pertinency where he expected none. He has that surprise which the Latin poet so poetically gives to the tree: *Miraturque novas frondes et non sua poma.*

II. *Direct prophecies* are those which relate to Christ and the gospel, and to them alone, and which cannot be taken in any other sense. Upon these we ought principally to insist, when we would prove the truth of our religion from the predictions of the Old Testament: and of these there is a considerable number. Such are those which mention the calling of the

¹ Matt. xiii. 34, 35. Compare Ps. lxxviii. 2, 3.

² Diogenes the Cynic was remarkable for this sort of wit, and many of his applications, or parodies of Homer, are very happy and ingenious.

Gentiles, the everlasting kingdom of the Son of man to be erected during the time of the Roman empire, and the second covenant. Such is the 110th Psalm: *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool, &c.* This is as plain as a prophetic description ought to be; it is applicable to Christ alone, and it sets forth his exaltation, his royal dignity, his priestly office, the propagation of his gospel, the obedience of his subjects, the destruction of his enemies, and of the Roman emperors who persecuted his church. But of this prophecy something more shall be said, when we come to the reign of Constantine.

III. A *Type* is a rough draught, a less accurate pattern or model, from which a more perfect image or work is made. Types, or typical prophecies, are things which happened and were done in ancient time, and are recorded in the Old Testament; and which are found afterwards to describe or represent something which befel our Lord, and which relates to him and to his gospel. For example: Under the law, a lamb was offered for a sin-offering, and thus an atonement was made for transgressions. John the Baptist calls Christ *the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world*³; and St. Peter tells Christians that they are redeemed *by the blood of Christ, as of a lamb*⁴. Hence we infer and conclude that the lamb was a type of Christ; and upon considering it, we find that it has all that can be required to constitute a type; for it is in many respects a very just and lively representation of Christ. The lamb died for no offence of his own, but for the sins of others; so did Christ: the lamb could not commit sin by his nature, nor Christ by his perfection: the lamb was without bodily spot or blemish; Christ was holy and undefiled: a lamb is meek and patient; such was the afflicted and much injured Son of God.

These types are useful to persons who have already received Christianity upon other and stronger evidence; as they show the beautiful harmony and correspondence between the Old and New Testament: but they seem not proper proofs to satisfy and convince doubters, who will say perhaps, with the school-men, *Theologia symbolica non est argumentativa.*

Unless we have the authority of the Scriptures of the New

³ John i. 29, 36.

⁴ 1 Pet. i. 19.

Testament for it, we cannot conclude with certainty that this or that person,⁵ or this or that thing mentioned in the Old Testament is a type of Christ, on account of the resemblance which we may perceive between them: but we may admit it as probable.

IV. There are *prophecies of double senses*, admitting no more than two senses, which are nearly of the same kind with typical prophecies; and many of which might perhaps be cleared up by observing that the prophet meant one thing, and the Spirit of God, who spake by him, meant another thing; for the Holy Spirit so overruled the prophets as to make them use words which, strictly and rigidly interpreted, could not mean what

⁵ Joseph was a *Nazarene*, as the word may denote a *separate person*. And though he were not under a Nazarite's vow, yet, as he was separate from his brethren, he is called *Nazir*, a *Nazarite* (Gen. xlix. 26), in the more general and lax signification of the word. And there is a very singular correspondence between him and Jesus. Joseph was the beloved son of his father; and so is Jesus too. But as he was hated by his brethren, so Jesus came to *his own*, and *his own received him not*. If the sun, moon, and stars did, in a figure, obeisance to Joseph, they did it to Jesus without a trope. *Come, let us kill him*, was the language of the brethren both of Joseph and of Jesus. They were both sold for pieces of money; both became servants. The bloody coat of Joseph answers to the blood of Jesus. They were both forced down into Egypt; both were *numbered with transgressors*. Joseph is imprisoned with Pharaoh's butler and baker; one of them is saved, the other destroyed: Jesus suffers with two thieves, and one of them is saved also. Joseph sold corn, and saves his people; so does Jesus, the multiplier of loaves, and the bread of life. If Joseph exhorted his brethren to peace, so did Jesus. If they bowed the knee to Joseph, *every knee must bow to Jesus*. If Joseph were highly exalted upon his sufferings, so was Jesus. They were both *men of sorrow*, both *fruitful branches*, both lifted up from a low and sorrowful condition.

Samson was a Nazarite in the strictest sense, and a perpetual one, and a type of the Messiah too, as the Jews intimate in their two Targums upon Gen. xlix. 18. A very fit type he was of Jesus Christ. He was so in his very birth; he was the son of a barren woman; Jesus of a virgin. The tidings of the birth of Samson were brought to his mother by an angel, as was that of the birth of Jesus. *He shall be a Nazarite*, says the Angel of Samson; and of Jesus it is said that *he dwelt in Nazareth*, that it might be fulfilled which was said by the Prophets, *he shall be called a Nazarene*. Of Samson the angel foretells that he should deliver Israel; and the angel tells of Jesus, that he should save his people. An angel was sent to satisfy both Manoah and Joseph. If the Spirit of God be said to move Samson, that Spirit descended upon Jesus, and led him into the wilderness. If Samson marries a Philistine woman, Jesus espoused the Gentiles. Samson killed the lion, destroyed the Philistines, removed the gates of the city, and at his death gave the greatest blow to his enemies; but it is Jesus Christ that overcame the devil and the world, and got the conquest of death and hell, that destroyed the devil by his death, and that raised himself up from death to life.—Kidder's *Demonstr. of the Messias*, ch. iii.

themselves intended. Somewhat of this kind is the prophecy of the high priest Caiaphas; for the Spirit of God has sometimes spoken by bad men. When the chief priests and Pharisees consulted what they should do with Jesus, the high priest said, *Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.* His meaning was plainly this, that it mattered not whether Christ were guilty or innocent, because the public safety absolutely required his death. *And this spake he,* says St. John, *not of himself; but, being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation,*⁶ that is, be a sacrifice and atonement for their sins. He prophesied then, and knew it not; for he had himself another intent and meaning.

As Daniel⁷ says that he knew not the meaning of the prediction which he delivered, so the Gentiles, if we may be permitted to introduce them upon this occasion, have remarked concerning their prophets, that they knew not the import of their own prophecies; or rather that they were merely passive, and knew not even that they were speaking:—*λέγουσι μὲν πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ, ἴσασι δὲ οὐδὲν ὧν λέγουσι,* says Socrates.⁸ The Sibyl also says, or is made to say, concerning herself,⁹

— οὔτε γὰρ οἶδα

“Ὅττι λέγω, κέλεται δὲ Θεός [με] ἕκαστ’ ἀγορεύειν”

which is very like the words cited from Plato. So Tacitus:¹—*Tunc [sacerdos], haustâ fontis arcani aquâ, ignarus plerumque literarum et carminum, edit responsa versibus, &c.*

When the prophets of God spake in his name, they talked and acted like men who knew that they were prophesying. In some of the Pagan Oracles, the God is supposed to use the organs of the man, and the man is supposed to know nothing of the discourse. This appears to have been the case of some Demoniacs in the New Testament, in whom the evil spirit was the speaker. The Pagan prophets therefore either were, or pretended to be out of their senses; and by this argument some sly or credulous people imposed upon Justin Martyr (if he

⁶ John xi. 49—51.

⁷ Dan. xii. 8, 9.

⁸ In Plato's *Apol.* and in *Menon.* p. 99. *Ed. Steph.*

⁹ *Carm. Sibyll. L. ii.*

¹ *Annal. ii. 54.*

wrote the *Cohortatio*), and made an excuse for the nonsense and the faults against metre in the Sibylline oracles. The Sibyl, said they, uttered verses when she was inspired; when the inspiration ceased, she remembered nothing that she had said. They who attended her and wrote down her prophecies, being often unskilful and illiterate people, made frequent mistakes, and gave us lame verses and false quantities.²

Of *omens*, to which Pagan superstition paid great regard from the time of Homer, there were several, where the words of the omen had one sense, and the event, as they say, verified it in another sense. Here is a remarkable instance: *Cæcilia Metelli, dum sororis filiæ, adultæ ætatis virgini, more prisco, nocte concubia nuptialia petit, omen ipsa fecit. Nam cum in sacello quodam, ejus rei gratia, aliquamdiu persedisset, nec ulla vox proposito congruens esset audita; fessa longa standi mora puella rogavit materteram, ut sibi paulisper locum residendi accommodaret; cui illa, Ego vero, inquit, tibi mea sede cedo. Quod dictum, ab indulgentia profectum, ad certi ominis processit eventum: quoniam Metellus non ita multo post, mortua Cæcilia, virginem, de qua loquor, in matrimonium duxit.*³ Plutarch, in the life of Alexander, says: Βουλόμενος δὲ τῷ θεῷ χρήσασθαι περὶ τῆς στρατείας, ἦλθεν εἰς Δελφοὺς· καὶ κατὰ τύχην ἡμερῶν ἀποφράδων οὐσῶν, ἐν αἷς οὐ νενόμισται θεμιστεύειν, πρῶτον μὲν ἔπεμπεν παρακαλῶν τὸν πρόμαντιν· ὥς δὲ ἀρνούμενης καὶ προῖσχομένης τὸν νομὸν, αὐτὸς ἀναβὰς βίᾳ πρὸς τὸν ναὸν εἴλκεν αὐτήν, ἥ δὲ, ὥσπερ ἐξηττημένη τῆς σπουδῆς,

² *Cohort. ad Græc.* c. 38. See Smith on *Prophecy*, (c. 4.), who has collected passages from Plato and others, to show that the Pagan prophets were in a sort of phrensy and delirium. This is the very same excuse which the Pagans made for the bad style and other defects of their oracles. See Van Dale, *de Orac.* p. 162.

Since no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation (2 Pet. i. 20), that is, the meaning of prophecies is not what perhaps the prophet himself might imagine in his private judgment of the state of things then present, but *holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*; there may, therefore, very possibly, and very reasonably, be supposed to be many prophecies, which, though they may have a prior and immediate reference to some nearer event, yet by the Spirit of God (whom those prophecies which are express show to have had a further view) may have been directed to be uttered in such words, as may even more properly and more justly be applied to the great event which Providence had in view, than to the intermediate event which God designed only as a pledge or earnest of the other.—Clarke's *Evid. of Nat. and Rev. Rel.*

³ Val. Max. i. 5, 4. The same story is related by Cicero, *de Divin.* i. 46.

εἶπεν, Ἀνίκητος εἶ, ὦ παῖ. Τοῦτο ἀκούσας Ἀλέξανδρος, οὐκ ἔτι ἔφη χρήζειν ἑτέρου μαντεύματος, ἀλλὰ ἔχειν ὃν ἐβούλετο παρ' αὐτῆς χρησμόν.

If the words of Caiaphas will admit two senses, it follows not that they will admit ten, or as many as the teeming imagination of a fanatic can suggest; and prophecies of double senses, if such prophecies there be, may have meanings as determinate and fixed, as if they had only one sense. The same is true of allegorical writings. Horace⁴ says, *O navis, referent in mare te novi, etc.* The Commentators on this poem are divided; one part contend for the literal sense, and the other for the allegorical: but the ode has a double sense. The poet addresses himself to a real ship, and yet intended, under that image or emblem, to dissuade the Romans from exposing themselves again to a civil war. This will remove some difficulties raised by writers on both sides of the question. Mr. Warburton has made the same remark, and to him I resign it, as unto the first occupier; unless he will let me claim a part of it upon the privilege of friendship, and as κοινὰ τὰ τῶν φίλων. Indeed the interpretation is so unforced and obvious, that I wonder it came not into the mind of many persons.⁵

Moses said of the Paschal Lamb, *Neither shall ye break a bone thereof.*⁶ St. John says that this was fulfilled in Christ; whence it has been not unreasonably inferred, that those words had, with the most obvious sense, a prophetical, that is, a double sense.

David seems to speak concerning himself when he says, *Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, nor suffer thy holy one to see corruption.*⁷ He intended perhaps no more than this, Thou shalt not suffer me to come to an untimely end, to be killed by mine enemies, and cast into the grave: but then the divine impulse which was upon him, made him use words which should suit exactly to Christ, and to himself only in a loose and figurative sense. Of this the prophet himself might be sensible, and might know that his words had another import, and that they

⁴ Carm. i. 14.

⁵ Nevertheless there can be little doubt that the Ode is purely allegorical.—EDIT.

⁶ Exod. xii. 46. Compare John xix. 36.

⁷ Ps. xvi. 10. Compare Acts ii. 27, xiii. 35.

should be fulfilled twice, both in the sense which he intended, and in the sublimer sense of the Holy Spirit. By these means a shade was cast over the prophecy, and the sense of the Spirit was concealed till the event unfolded it, and made it conspicuous ; which obscurity seems to have been sometimes necessary, that the persons concerned in bringing about the accomplishment might not know what was predicted concerning them and their actions.⁸

*In Deut. it is said ; I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him. And, The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet in the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me ; unto him ye shall hearken.*⁹

1. The intention of Moses seems to have been to administer some consolation to the people who would soon be deprived of him, and, in him, of the best friend and ruler that any nation ever enjoyed. Therefore he took occasion to assure them that they should not be destitute of a prophet, and that God would, in compassion and kindness to them, supply the loss which they would sustain by the death of their deliverer and conductor.

2. When the law was delivered with dreadful pomp, and the voice of God was heard, and his majesty appeared in formidable splendor, the people were extremely terrified ; for it was an opinion common both amongst Jews and Pagans that no man could safely approach the Deity, and that death, or some great evil, was the consequence of beholding him.¹ Therefore they besought Moses to intreat for them that they might no more be brought into such danger. For this reason, and to calm their fears, Moses assured them that for the time to come God would speak to them, not in person, but by a mediator, by a prophet,

⁸ It is proper that men should be treated as free agents : and men are free ; at least, they think so ; and few of them will give up this persuasion, and suffer themselves to be quibbled out of their senses and experience. Truth and general utility will be found always to coincide ; and one would be glad to know what useful purposes can be served from the doctrine of fatalism. The fatalist will say, *It will make a man humble.* It is as likely to make him a mathematician, or a poet.

⁹ Deut. xviii. 15, 18, 19.

¹ See Le Clerc on Gen. xvi. 13.

by a man like themselves. *The Lord thy God*, says he, *will raise up unto thee a prophet—according to all that thou desiredst of the Lord thy God in Horeb, in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And the Lord said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken: I will raise them up a prophet.*²

3. The Pagan nations had their gods, their oracles, their soothsayers and magicians; and there was great danger lest the people of Israel should go and consult them, and so fall into idolatry; and in fact all these iniquities ensued in following times. That nothing might be wanting to guard against this corruption, and that the transgressors might be inexcusable, God positively forbade them to go after the gods, the priests, and the prophets of other nations, and promised them that they should never want a prophet of their own. Thus after the death of Moses, they had Joshua, and Samuel, and Elijah, and Elisha, and other illustrious men, besides the high priest by whom they used to consult God upon all important occasions. This interpretation is favoured by the context: *There shall not be found among you any one that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer.—For these nations which thou shalt possess, hearkened unto observers of times, and unto diviners: but as for thee, the Lord thy God hath not suffered thee to do so. The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken.—I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.*³

Some understand this of a succession of prophets in general, and more particularly of the Messiah, who of all the prophets resembled Moses the most. Others think that the Messiah alone is here foretold, since the words in a strict and accurate sense represent him alone. Each of these interpretations has

² Deut. xviii. 16, 17.

³ Deut. xviii. 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19.

had learned defenders:—*magno se judice quæque tuetur*. But I observe,

1. Both these interpretations agree in this, that Christ is here promised and foretold, nor indeed is the first very discordant from the second; for if Moses meant in general every prophet, and any prophet who should succeed him, the Messiah cannot be excluded, and if the Messiah resembles Moses in a particular manner, the prophecy points him out above all the rest.

2. St. Stephen and St. Peter⁴ say, that Jesus Christ is the prophet foretold by Moses, and Christ himself had probably this passage in view, when he said, *If ye had believed Moses, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me.*⁵

3. Though Moses might perhaps mean a succession of prophets, yet the Spirit of God, who was then upon him, guided him to use words which should describe the Messiah much better than any other prophet. The other prophets were only so far like unto Moses that they were prophets, but in many respects they were not like him. In the last chapter of Deuteronomy, there is an addition which was made to the Books of Moses, long after his death, by some prophet probably, who inserts the following remark: *And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses*. This has a manifest reference to the prophecy of which we are treating, and may be thus understood, Although Moses said that the Lord would raise up one like unto him, yet this prophecy has not yet been accomplished in a strict and full sense: there has not yet arisen one like unto him; but this great prophet is still to come.⁶

Add to this, that the resemblance between Moses and Christ is so very great and striking, that it is impossible to consider it fairly and carefully, without seeing and acknowledging that he must be foretold where he is so well described.⁷

⁴ Acts iii. 22, 23; vii. 37.

⁵ John v. 46.

⁶ This last chapter of Deuteronomy seems to have been composed by two authors, and at two different times: the first part down to the ninth verse soon after the death of Moses; the three last verses long afterwards.

⁷ Ammonius wrote a book commended by Eusebius and Jerome, *Περὶ τῆς Μωϋσέως καὶ Ἰησοῦ συμφωνίας* (Euseb. E. H. vi. 19), *De Consensu Moysis et Iesu* (Jerom. Vir. Ill. c. 55), which is not extant. Whether this treatise was designed to show the resemblance and agreement between the persons, or between their doctrines, we cannot say; perhaps it was the latter.

Eusebius has treated the subject, on which I am entering, in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*; ⁸ but as he was hastening to other points, he has not discussed this so fully as to discourage those who should be inclined to attempt the same thing. I shall, therefore, endeavour to make several improvements upon his remarks, and additions to them.⁹

1. First, and which is the principal of all, Moses was a law-giver, and the mediator of a covenant between God and man: so was Christ. Here the resemblance is the more considerable, because no other prophet besides them executed this high office. The other prophets were only interpreters and enforcers of the law, and in this were greatly inferior to Moses. The Messiah could not be like unto Moses in a strict sense, unless he were a legislator.¹ He must give a law to men, and consequently a more excellent law, and a better covenant than the first; for if the first had been perfect, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews argues, there could have been no room for a second.²

2. Other prophets had revelations in dreams and visions, but Moses talked with God, with the Λόγος, face to face: so Christ

[*Ammonius*, who obtained the appellation of Σακκοφόρος, more commonly abbreviated into Σακκάς, from the office which he held of public *porter*, charged with the unlading of vessels conveying corn to the port of Alexandria. He was born in that city, of Christian parents, about A. D. 160; and acquired great reputation by his lectures in philosophy, and is said to have numbered among his disciples Photinus, Longinus, Herennius, Origen, and others. Porphyry (Ap. Euseb. ii. 5, vi. 19) has insinuated that he was an apostate from Christianity; but Eusebius and Jerome agree in maintaining his sincerity, though doubtless his religious sentiments were strongly imbued with the tenets of Plato, whom he had studied with the most eager admiration. Indeed he is the reputed founder of the sect of the *New Platonists* or *Eclectics*, who professed to select their dogmas from what was reasonable in all other systems, considerately including Christianity in the list. Lardner, however, contends that the Christian and the philosopher are distinct individuals; but, whether right or wrong, the alternative is not worth debating. Of the tenets of the *Eclectics* see Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, note 33. Besides the work above mentioned, Ammonius was the author of a *Diatessaron*, or *Evangelical Harmony*, which is still extant in a Latin version, and proves the important fact, that at the close of the second century there were *four* authentic Gospels and no more; and that they were the same as those which we still possess. He died, A. D. 243—EDIT.]

⁸ L. iii. c. 2.

⁹ See also Bishop Newton on the Prophecies, Disc. vi.—EDIT.

¹ By this prediction Moses guarded the people against the prejudice which his own authority was like to create against a new lawgiver; telling them beforehand, that, when the great prophet came, their obedience ought to be transferred to him.—Bp. Sherlock, *Disc.* ii.

² Heb. viii. 7.

spake that which he had seen with the Father. *If there be a prophet among you, says God to Aaron and Miriam, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all my house; with him I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches, and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold.*³

3. Moses in his infancy was wonderfully preserved from the cruelty of a tyrant, and from the destruction of all the male children: so was Christ.

4. Moses fled from his country to escape the hands of the king: so did Christ, when his parents carried him into Egypt. Afterwards *the Lord said to Moses in Midian, Go, return into Egypt: for all the men are dead which sought thy life.*⁴ So the angel of the Lord said to Joseph, in almost the same words, *Arise, and take the young child, and go into the land of Israel; for they are dead which sought the young child's life;*⁵ pointing him out, as it were, for that prophet who should arise like unto Moses.

5. Moses refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction:⁶ Christ had the kingdoms of the world offered him by Satan, and rejected them; and when the people would have made him a king, he hid himself, choosing rather to suffer affliction.

6. Moses, says St. Stephen, *was learned, ἐπαιδεύθη, in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and in deeds;*⁷ and Josephus⁸ says that he was a very forward and accomplished youth, and had wisdom and knowledge beyond his years, which is taken from Jewish tradition, and which of itself is highly probable. St. Luke observes of Christ, that *he increased (betimes) in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and*

³ Num. xii. 6—8. All the prophets of the Old Testament saw visions and dreamed dreams; all the prophets of the New were in the same state. St. Peter had a vision, St. John saw visions, St. Paul had visions and dreams. But Christ neither saw visions, nor dreamed a dream, but had an intimate and immediate communication with the Father; he was in the Father's bosom, and he, and no man else, had seen the Father.—Moses and Christ are the only two in all the sacred history, who had this communication with God.—Bp. Sherlock, *Disc.* vi.

⁴ Exod. iv. 19.

⁵ Matt. ii. 20.

⁶ Heb. xi. 24, 25.

⁷ Acts vii. 22.

⁸ Ant. Jud. ii. 9.

man,⁹ and his discourses in the Temple with the doctors, when he was twelve years old, were a proof of it. The difference was that Moses acquired his early knowledge by human instruction, and Christ by a divine *afflatus*. To both of them might be applied what Callimachus elegantly feigns of Jupiter:

Ὅξυ δ' ἀνήβησας, ταχίνοι δέ τοι ἦλθον ἱουλοι

Ἄλλ' ἔτι παιδὺνδ' ἔων ἐφράσσαι πάντα τέλεια.

Swift was thy growth, and early was thy bloom,

But earlier wisdom crown'd thy infant days.

7. Moses delivered his people from cruel oppression and a heavy bondage: so did Christ from the worse tyranny of sin and Satan.

8. Moses contended with the magicians, and had the advantage over them so manifestly, that they could no longer withstand him, but were forced to acknowledge the divine power by which he was assisted: Christ ejected evil spirits, and received the same acknowledgments from them.

9. Moses assured the people whom he conducted, that if they would be obedient, they should enter into the happy land of promise: which land was usually understood by the wiser Jews to be an emblem and a figure of that eternal and celestial kingdom to which Christ opened an entrance.

10. Moses reformed the nation corrupted with Egyptian superstition and idolatry: Christ restored true religion.

11. Moses wrought a great variety of miracles: so did Christ; and in this the parallel is remarkable, since besides Christ *there arose not a prophet in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face, in all the signs and the wonders which the Lord sent him to do.*¹

12. Moses was not only a lawgiver, a prophet, and a worker of miracles, but a king and a priest. He is called *a king*;² and he had indeed, though not the pomp and the crown and sceptre, yet the authority of a king, and was the supreme magistrate; and the office of *priest* he often exercised. In all these offices the resemblance between Moses and Christ was singular.³

⁹ Luke ii. 52.

¹ Deut. xxxiv. 10, 11.

² Deut. xxxiii. 5.

³ In the interpretation of Deut. xxxiii. 5, I prefer the sense of Grotius and Selden to Le Clerc's. The parallel between Moses and Christ requires it, and no objection can be made to it. The Apostolical constitutions also, if their judgment be of any weight, call Moses *high priest and king*, τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ βασιλέα (vi. 3).

13. Moses, says Theodoret, married an Ethiopian woman, at which his relations were much offended; and in this he was a type of Christ, who espoused the church of the Gentiles, whom the Jews were very unwilling to admit to the same favours and privileges with themselves. But I should not choose to lay a great stress upon this typical similitude, though it is ingenious.

14. Moses fasted in the desert forty days and nights before he gave the Law: so did Elias, the restorer of the Law: and so did Christ before he entered into his ministry.

15. Moses fed the people miraculously in the wilderness: so did Christ, with bread, and with doctrine; and the manna which descended from heaven, and the loaves which Christ multiplied, were proper images of the spiritual food which the Saviour of the world bestowed upon his disciples. *Our fathers*, said the Jews, *did eat manna in the desert forty years, as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat. Jesus said unto them, My Father (now) giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he that cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world. I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.*⁴ The metaphors of *hungering* and *thirsting* after virtue and knowledge, and of eating and drinking them; and the representation of benefits of any kind under the expressions of food and drink, have been common in all writers sacred and profane.⁵ St. Paul says to the Corinthians; *All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ.*⁶ Whether the passage of the Israelites through the sea and under the cloud, the water issuing from the rock which Moses smote, and the manna which descended from heaven,

⁴ John vi. 31, 32, 33, 35.

⁵ See Isaiah xli. 17, lv. i. Eccles. xxiv. 21. Wisd. xi. 14. Matt. v. 6. John vii. 37. So Xen. Cyr. iv. 6. 7, ἐγὼ ὑμῖν διψῶ χαρίζεσθαι. Econ. xiii. 9, πεινώσι τοῦ ἐπαίνου οὐχ ἥττον ἐνίαι τῶν φυσέων ἢ ἄλλαι τῶν σίτων τε καὶ ποτῶν. Philo. Jud. p. 867, τοὺς ποτίμων διψῶντας λόγων. Cic. ad. Q. fr. iii. 5, *Nec honores sitio, nec desidero gloriam.* Virg. Æn. iii. 57, *Auri sacra fames.* Hor. Epist. i. 18, 23, *Argenti sitis importunaque fames.* Hence Artemid. Oneir. i. 68, τὸ διψᾶν οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἢ ἐπιθυμεῖν. EDIT.

⁶ 1 Cor. x. 1, 3, 4. See Whitby, Doddridge, and A. Clarke, ad locum. EDIT.

were types intended to be fulfilled in Christ and in the benefits and privileges of Christianity; or whether the apostle referred to these things by way of allusion, similitude, and accommodation; I determine not.

16. Moses led the people through the sea: Christ walked upon it, and enabled Peter to do so.

17. Moses commanded the sea to retire and give way: Christ commanded the winds and the waves to be still.

18. Moses brought darkness over the land: the sun withdrew his light at Christ's crucifixion. And as the darkness which was spread over Egypt was followed by the destruction of⁷ their first born, and of Pharaoh and his host: so the darkness at Christ's death was the forerunner of the destruction of the Jews, when, in the metaphorical and prophetic style, and according to Christ's express prediction, *the sun was darkened and the moon withdrew her light, and the stars fell from heaven*; ⁸ the Ecclesiastical and civil state of the Jews was overturned, and the rulers of both were destroyed.

19. The face of Moses shone, when he descended from the mountain: the same happened unto Christ at his transfiguration on the mountain. Moses and Elias appeared then with him, to show that the law and the prophets bare witness to him; and the Divine Voice said, *This is my beloved Son, hear ye him*, alluding most evidently to the prediction of Moses, *unto him shall ye hearken*.⁹

20. Moses cleansed one leper: Christ many.

21. Moses foretold the calamities which would befall the nation for their disobedience: so did Christ.

⁷ Mr. Wasse had a conjecture, that the untimely death of Pharaoh's first-born son, who was, perhaps, better beloved than his father, gave occasion to the song, which the Greeks call *Linus*, and which they had from the Egyptians. Herod. ii. 79, Ἔστι δὲ Αἰγυπτιστὶ ὁ Λῖνος καλούμενος Μανέρως. Ἐφασαν δὲ μιν Αἰγύπτιοι τοῦ πρώτου βασιλεύσαντος Αἰγύπτου παῖδα μονογενέα γενέσθαι, ἀποθανόντα δ' αὐτὸν ἄνωρον θρήνοισι τούτοις ὑπ' Αἰγυπτίων τιμηθῆναι, καὶ αἰοδῆν τε ταύτην πρώτην καὶ μούνην σφίσι γενέσθαι. It may be observed, though it is a trifle, that Gronovius gives us *Λῖνος* circumflexed; but the first syllable is short in the best writers, and Moschus says in *Epitaph Bion*. ΑΙΛΙΝΑ μοι στοναχεῖτε νάπαι, καὶ Δώριον ὕδωρ. Soph. *Ajac*. 632, Αἴλιον, αἴλιον.

⁸ Matt. xxiv. 29. See the commentators on the passage, and Kidder's *Demonst. Mess.* iii. p. 17.—EDIT. ⁹ Matt. xvii. 5.

22. Moses chose and appointed seventy elders to be over the people: Christ chose such a number of disciples.

23. The spirit which was in Moses was conferred in some degree upon the seventy elders, and they prophesied: Christ conferred miraculous powers upon his seventy disciples.

24. Moses sent twelve men to spy out the land which was to be conquered: Christ sent his apostles into the world to subdue it by a more glorious and miraculous conquest.

25. Moses was victorious over powerful kings, and great nations: so was Christ, by the effects of his religion, and by the fall of those who persecuted his Church.

26. Moses conquered Amelec by lifting and holding up both his hands all the day: Christ overcame his and our enemies when his hands were fastened to the cross. This resemblance has been observed by some of the ancient Christians, and ridiculed by some of the moderns; but without sufficient reason, I think.

27. Moses interceded for transgressors and caused an atonement to be made for them, and stopped the wrath of God: so did Christ.

28. Moses ratified a covenant between God and the people, by sprinkling them with blood: Christ with his own blood.

29. Moses desired to die for the people, and prayed that God would forgive them, or blot him out of his book: Christ did more, he died for sinners.

30. Moses instituted the Passover, when a lamb was sacrificed, none of whose bones were to be broken, and whose blood¹

¹ Levit. xvii. 11, 12. *The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul. Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, No soul of you shall eat blood, &c.* Here appears the reason of this strict and often repeated prohibition. Blood was appointed as the atonement for sin; it was set apart and sanctified for that purpose; and consequently, when the use of the altar and sacrifices ceased at the death of Christ, the prohibition of eating blood should cease also, and the precept concerning it in the Acts of the Apostles (xv. 20, 29) seems to have been prudential and temporary. Of clean animals, the blood was to be shed and thrown away; of unclean, no part was to be eaten: of clean fishes, the blood seems to be no where expressly forbidden; perhaps, because their blood was never offered up in sacrifice. The eating of a clean animal, that died of itself, is not forbidden with the same rigour; perhaps because the blood was coagulated, and not in a condition to be offered up to God. See Levit. xvii. 15, and Deut. xiv. 21.

protected the people from destruction: Christ was that paschal lamb.

31. Moses lifted up the serpent, that they who looked upon him might be healed of their mortal wounds: Christ was that serpent. *As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.*²

The serpent, being an emblem of Satan, may be thought an unfit image to represent Christ: but the serpents which bit the people of Israel are called *fiery* serpents, *Seraphim*.³ Now, *Sunt boni Angeli Seraphim, sunt mali Angeli Seraphim, quos nulla figura melius quam prestere exprimas. Et tali usum primum humani generis seductorem putat Bachai.*⁴ Therefore Christ, as he was the great and good angel, the angel of God's presence, the angel κατ' ἐξοχήν, might be represented as a kind seraph, a beneficent healing serpent, who should abolish the evil introduced by the seducing lying serpent; and who, like the serpent of Moses, should destroy the serpents of the magicians, as one of those gentle serpents, who are friends to mankind:—Ovid, *Metam.* iv. 601.

Nunc quoque nec fugiunt hominem, nec vulnere lædunt,
Quidque prius fuerint, placidi meminere dracones,

Herod. ii. 74. Εἰσὶ δὲ περὶ Θήβας ἱποὶ ὄφεις, ἀνθρώπων οὐδαμῶς δηλήμονες.⁵

In Isaiah,⁶ the Seraphim are represented as praising God. Origen had a notion that these Seraphim were two, and that they were the *Son* and the *Spirit* of God; a paradox, which,

² John iii. 14, 15.

³ Num. xxi. 6.

⁴ Grotius.

⁵ Possemus hinc, says *Le Clerc*, incipere ostendere similitudinem serpentis ænei, et Christi ipsius: nam ut nemo credidisset salutiferum futurum esse Israëlitis, ab chersydris demorsis, conspectum ænei serpentis; ita nec quisquam poterat, eo tempore quo res contigit, sperare hominis crucifixi cognitionem unicam fore viam, qua homines ad fidem Deo habendam, parendumque Evangelio, ex omnibus gentibus brevi adducendi essent. Verum hoc aliaque id genus theologis latius diducenda atque illustranda relinquimus. Vide eos ad *Joan.* iii. 14.

[Possibly, however, those commentators are to be preferred who are of opinion that the resemblance is not between Christ and the serpent itself, but between the *elevation* of the serpent and the *suspension* of Christ on the cross. Thus Justin Martyr regards the pole, on which the brazen serpent was lifted up, as τύπος σταυροῦ (*Apol.* ii. p. 91); and Tertullian (*de Idol.* c. 5.) supposes, *figuram designasse Dominicæ crucis*.—EDIT.]

⁶ Isai. vi. 2, &c.

though scarcely to be maintained, yet deserved not the severe censures which Jerome in his wrath was pleased to bestow upon it.⁷

Æsculapius, the god of physic, and of all the Pagan deities supposed to be the most beneficent, appeared, according to Pagan tradition, in the form of a serpent; and a serpent was sacred to him, and is described twisting round his rod.

32. All the affection which Moses showed towards the people, all the cares and toils which he underwent on their account, were repaid by them with ingratitude, murmuring, and rebellion, and sometimes they threatened to stone him: the same returns the Jews made to Christ for all his benefits.

33. Moses was ill used by his own family; his brother and sister rebelled against him: there was a time when Christ's own brethren believed not in him.

34. Moses had a very wicked and perverse generation committed to his care and conduct, and to enable him to rule them, miraculous powers were given to him; and he used his utmost endeavours to make the people obedient to God, and to save them from ruin, but in vain; in the space of forty years they all fell in the wilderness, except two: Christ also was given to a generation not less wicked and perverse, his instructions and his miracles were lost upon them, and in about the same space of time, after they had rejected him, they were destroyed.

35. Moses was very meek above all the men that were on the face of the earth: so was Christ.

36. The people could not enter into the land of promise till Moses was dead: by the death of Christ the kingdom of heaven was opened to believers.

37. In the death of Moses and Christ, there is also a resemblance of some circumstances. Moses died, in one sense, for the iniquities of the people; it was their rebellion which was the occasion of it, which drew down the displeasure of God upon them and upon him. *The Lord*, says Moses to them, *was angry with me for your sakes, saying, Thou shalt not go in thither, but thou shalt die.*⁸ Moses therefore went up, in the

⁷ See Vitringa. Eusebius says something very like it (*Præp. Evang.* vii. 15); where the notes of Vigerus may be consulted.

⁸ Deut. i. 37.

sight of the people, to the top of Mount Nebo, and there he died, when he was in perfect vigour; when *his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.*⁹ Christ suffered for the sins of men, and was led up, in the presence of the people, to mount Calvary, where he died in the flower of his age, and when he was in his full natural strength. Neither Moses nor Christ, as far as we may collect from sacred history, were ever sick, or felt any bodily decay or infirmity, which would have rendered them unfit for the toils they underwent: their sufferings were of another kind.

38. Moses was buried, and no man knew where his body lay: nor could the Jews find the body of Christ.

39. Lastly, as Moses a little before his death promised the people that *God would raise them up a prophet like unto him;*¹ so Christ, taking leave of his afflicted disciples, told them, *I will not leave you comfortless, I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter.*²

Is this similitude and correspondence in so many things between Moses and Christ the effect of mere chance? Let us search all the records of universal history, and see if we can find a man who was so like to Moses as Christ was, and so like to Christ as Moses was. If we cannot find such a one, then have we found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth the Son of God.

But this is not all, for God adds: *And it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.*³ The Jews rejected Christ, and God rejected them, and gave them up to destruction: and as their offence against the Messiah, and their behaviour after his death, was wicked beyond measure and beyond example; so God fulfilled the prophecies of Moses concerning them, that he would require it of them, and that he would make their plagues wonderful, would bring upon them calamities beyond measure and beyond example.

It may be observed that a person can be produced, who was very like to Moses; namely, *Bacchus*, who was an Egyptian God. Huetius, in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, has with much

⁹ Deut. xxxiv. 7. ¹ Deut. xviii. 18. ² John xiv. 16, 18. ³ Deut. xviii. 19.

⁴ A book which has its use and value, but is more remarkable for erudition than

accuracy and learning drawn up the comparison, and the resemblance is so great, in so many particulars, that it cannot be supposed accidental: but then, first, Bacchus is a poetical deity, and the accounts of him are taken from fabulous history; and secondly, many of the actions of the Jewish Legislator were, in all probability, ascribed to him, and he is^s Moses in disguise: so the parallel ceases.

The economy of the Jewish and of the Christian Church is similar, in many respects, and upon the whole; though in smaller occurrences the resemblance ought not to be too much urged; for so anything may be made of anything. The parallel between Moses and Christ has been examined, in which we are authorised to seek and to expect a strong resemblance, both from the Old Testament, which declares that a prophet should arise like unto Moses; and from the New, which declares that Christ was that prophet. It deserves consideration, whether this consequence may be deduced, that if Moses was a type of Christ, the people whom he delivered and conducted may be a type of the people to whom Christ was sent, and of the Church which he established. If this should be admitted as a probability (and it should not be offered as anything more than conjectural) we may say that the generation which fell in the wilderness represents the Jews who rejected Christ, and perished for their disobedience. The land of promise and of rest was a symbol of the church of Christ. The idolatry and iniquities of the Jewish nation are too exactly paralleled by the corruption which overspread the Christian church. Many other resemblances might be pointed out which shall be omitted, since we cannot make it sufficiently evident that they were not accidental.

The destruction of Jerusalem, and that *second* coming of the Son of man to take vengeance of his foes, may perhaps prefigure

for reasoning; which made a French writer say of it, in the words of Terence, *ut te, cum tua Monstratione, magnus perdat Jupiter!*

^s The Egyptians, as Herodotus tells us (ii. 42), had a story concerning their God Hercules, Ἡρακλέα θελήσαι πάντως ιδέσθαι τὸν Δία, καὶ τὸν οὐκ ἐθέλειν ὀφθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ· τέλος δὲ, ἐπεὶ τε λιπαρέειν τὸν Ἡρακλέα, τὸν Δία μηχανήσασθαι, κρίον ἐκδείραντα προέχεσθαι τε τὸν κεφαλὴν ἀποταμόντα τοῦ κριοῦ, καὶ ἐνδύντα τὸ νάκος, οὕτω αἱ ἐαυτὸν ἐπιδέξαι. [*An legendum ἐπιδείξαι?*—EDIT.] This Hercules seems to have been Moses, who said to God, *I beseech thee, shew me thy glory.* And he said, *Thou canst not see my face,* &c. (Exod. xxxiii. 18.)

the destruction of anti-christian tyranny, and the manifestation of Christ, that is, of his power and spirit; and then may commence a better and happier era, and such a renovation as may be called *new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness*⁶.

VII. ON MIRACLES.

I. *On Miracles in general.*—One of the great arguments for the truth of Christianity is taken from the *Miracles* of our Saviour and his Apostles. It seems to be rashness for us, who know so little of the powers of intellectual and spiritual agents, and of the scheme of divine Providence, to affirm that (the miracles of the Old and New Testament excepted) God never wrought any,

⁶ 2 Pet. iii. 13. [See the commentators.—EDIT.]

The correspondencies of types and antitypes, though they are not themselves proper proofs of the truth of a doctrine, yet they may be very reasonable confirmations of the foreknowledge of God; of the uniform view of Providence under different dispensations; of the analogy, harmony, and agreement between the Old Testament and the New. The words in the Law concerning one particular kind of death, *He that is hanged, is accursed of God*, can hardly be conceived to have been put in upon any other account, than with a view and foresight of the application made of it by St. Paul. The analogies between the *Paschal lamb*, and the *Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world*; between the *Egyptian bondage*, and the *tyranny of sin*; between the *baptism of the Israelites in the sea and in the cloud*, and the *baptism of Christians*; between the *passage through the wilderness*, and through the *present world*; between *Jesus [Joshua] bringing the people into the promised land*, and *Jesus Christ being the Captain of Salvation to believers*; between the *Sabbath of rest promised to the people of God in the earthly Canaan*, and the *eternal rest promised in the heavenly Canaan*; between the *liberty granted from the time of the death of the high priest, to him that had fled into a city of refuge*, and the *redemption purchased by the death of Christ*; between the *high priest entering into the holy place every year with the blood of others*, and *Christ's once entering with his own blood into heaven itself, to appear in the presence of God for us*: these, I say, and innumerable other analogies, between the *shadows of things to come, of good things to come, the shadows of heavenly things, the figures for the time then present, patterns of things in the heavens, and the heavenly things themselves*, cannot, without the force of strong prejudice, be conceived to have happened by mere chance, without any foresight or design. There are no such analogies, much less such series of analogies, found in the books of mere enthusiastic writers living in such remote ages from each other. It is much more credible and reasonable to suppose, what St. Paul affirms, that *these things were our examples*; and that, in the uniform course of God's government of the world, *all these things happened unto them of old for examples, and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come*. And hence arises that aptness of similitude, in the application of several legal performances to the morality of the Gospel, that it can very hardly be supposed not to have been originally intended.—Clarke's *Evid. of Nat. and Rev. Relig.*

or never suffered any to be wrought by spirits good or evil. It is true that fraud, and fiction, and credulity, and ignorance of natural powers, and a strong imagination, and a disordered understanding, and misguided zeal, have been the parents of ten thousand false wonders. *Van Dale* rejected everything of the preternatural kind, which is related to have appeared in the Pagan world, and resolved it all into imposture; and said that there were no real miracles, any more than real predictions, except those of which God was the author: but *Le Clerc*, in his account of *Van Dale's* works, shows that this is affirming too much, and talking unphilosophically; and that we have not sufficient grounds to determine in so positive a manner⁷. *Le Clerc* might perhaps have fallen into *Van Dale's* opinion, to which he had a certain propensity, if he had not been a careful reader of *Cudworth* and *Grew*. These two Christian philosophers led him into another way of thinking, and suggested to him strong motives for hesitation.

A *Miracle* is a sensible operation, contrary to the common course of nature, wrought either by the immediate act, or by the assistance, or by the permission of God.

Miracles cannot directly prove the truth or falsehood, the reasonableness or absurdity of any doctrine. As they are appeals to our senses, so are doctrines to our reason. They are properly credentials and testimonials, which when a man can produce openly and fairly, if he teaches nothing absurd, much more if his doctrines and precepts appear to be good and beneficial, he ought to be obeyed.

Some learned men have affirmed that God alone can work miracles; which is not to be proved by reason, nor to be reconciled with the Scriptures without giving them the torture, and stretching or paring them to the hypothesis: and the contrary notion is more prevalent. But opinions fall and rise again, and we may expect to see this discarded system set up to try its fortune once more⁸. This inconvenience attends it, that if every miraculous operation be ascribed to God alone, when once a miracle is judged to be well attested, all inquiries into the rea-

⁷ *Bibl. Chois.* iii. p. 106.

⁸ We have indeed lived to see more than this; in the miracle-denying *Neologist* of Germany on the one hand, and the semi-Romanist *Tractarian* on the other.—EDIT.

sonableness of the doctrine, which it was wrought to support, are in a manner superseded; but in the other system, which supposes that evil spirits may work miracles as well as good ones, full leave is left to examine the doctrines, with less danger of being led astray.

But God will not permit evil spirits to delude men. Say, to delude wise and good men to their hurt; and it is true. He permits evil men to impose upon some persons by false wonders and impostures; and then, *Homo homini Dæmon*: as to the consequences, the effect is the same, and the believer is deluded, though no devil overreaches him.

II. *On the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles.*—The miracles recorded in the New Testament recommend themselves to our belief upon the following accounts:—

1. They were wrought by persons who gave other proofs of their mission, and who rest not the whole of their cause upon miracles; but insist also upon the reasonableness of their doctrines, and offer them to examination.

2. By persons who appealed to God, and declared that they would perform them. By acting in the name of the God and Father of all, they gave the best kind of proof that they were supported by him, and thereby prevented objections that the wonder might happen by chance; or be effected by a secret fatal power of which themselves knew nothing, or by evil demons; or for other ends and purposes; and they laid themselves under a necessity of fulfilling their promises, or of passing for impostors.

3. By persons known to be poor, unlearned, of a low condition, and destitute of great friends and powerful patrons.

4. They were performed in a public manner, which is a circumstance necessary to establish their credit: for though miracles may be wrought in secret, and cannot be disproved, only because they were seen by few, yet they often afford motives for suspicion; and a wise inquirer would perhaps suspend his assent in such cases, and pass no judgment about them.

5. The writers of the New Testament, when they relate the miracles, often name the time, the place, the occasion, the circumstances, the diseases that were removed, the persons healed or raised, the persons who were present, and the things that were

said and done by friends and foes on the occasion; giving men an opportunity to inquire into the facts, and to disprove them if they were able. Quadratus, who wrote his Apology for Christianity about A.D. 124, says that there were persons alive even in his days, upon whom Christ had wrought miracles; and it is very probable that some of those who were cured of their infirmities, and raised from the dead by our Saviour, were preserved by Providence to an extreme old age, to be living witnesses of his power and goodness⁹.

6. They were performed before enemies, or unbelievers, or doubters and persons not yet convinced; as indeed it was highly fit that they should: for miracles, in the main, are not so much designed for those who believe, as for those who believe not, and who are as yet undetermined, and want proper motives of persuasion.

7. They were wrought in a learned age and civilised countries, and in the politest and best inhabited parts of the world, where persons are not easily deluded, and are rather disposed to hesitate upon strange and unexpected appearances, and to examine, than to be ductile and over credulous.

8. They were accompanied with no appearance of pride, vanity, and ostentation. When a man preaches up himself, and assumes haughty airs of importance and superiority, he gives cause for suspicion. Such was the case of Simon the magician, as St. Luke¹ represents him; who seems to have had for his principal view to pass for a very great person amongst the Samaritans. But the behaviour of the apostles, in this respect, was unexceptionable; and our Saviour during his ministry acted as a servant and a prophet sent from God, ascribing all his miracles to his Father.

9. They were wrought for no worldly advantage. As nothing of that kind was sought, so nothing was obtained by our Lord and by his disciples. Obscure indeed they could not be, who were endued with such powers; and despised they could not be by their friends and followers: but these were small temporal advantages set against the obloquy, the opposition, the injuries, the afflictions, and the sufferings which they underwent. To do

⁹ *Apud Euseb.* iv. 3. [See below, under *Irenæus*.—EDIT.]

¹ Acts viii. 9.

good and to receive evil was their portion, and poverty was their lot and their choice².

10. They were wrought in confirmation of doctrines good and useful to mankind. The excellence of Christian morality will not be contested by fair and candid adversaries; and the few objections which may be made to it, are grounded on passages not rightly understood, nor justly interpreted.

11. They were performed at a time when men wanted neither power nor inclination to expose them, if they were impostures: and were in no danger of being called atheists and heretics, and of being insulted by the populace, and persecuted by the civil magistrate, for deriding them.

12. They were various and numerous, and of a permanent nature; and might be reviewed and re-examined. When our Saviour was risen from the dead, it could not be said of him, that he appeared only like a phantom for a moment;

Ostendunt terris hunc tantum Fata, neque ultra
Esse sinunt :

for he showed himself alive to his apostles by many repeated infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days.

13. They had nothing fantastical and cruel; but were acts of kindness and beneficence, calculated to excite gratitude more than fear, and to persuade rather than to terrify. Our Saviour performed no miracles of the severe kind, and the apostles very few, and no more than were necessary for wise and good purposes.

14. They prevailed upon many persons to quit the religion in which they had been educated, and, with it, ease and pleasure and worldly conveniences; to give up ample fortunes, to disoblige their dearest friends and relations, to offend rulers and magistrates, to leave their country, and to suffer all kinds of temporal evils, and the loss of life.

² Tertull. Scorp. p. 633. *Quæ tamen passos Apostolos scimus, manifesta doctrina est; hanc intelligo solam, Acta decurrens; nihil quæro; carceres illic, et vincula, et flagella, et saxa, et gladii, et impetus Judæorum, et cætus nationum, et tribunorum elogia, et regum auditoria, et proconsulum tribunalia, et Cæsaris nomen, interpretem non habent.* Instead of *solam*, it should be *sola*, or *solùm*; and for *habent*, *interpretem non avent*, or *havent*: want not, stand not in need of an interpreter. [*Solam* is right; unless *hæc* be also substituted for *hanc*.—EDIT.]

15. They were attested by proper witnesses. The disciples of Christ saw the miracles of their Master, and died in confirmation of them ; particularly of his resurrection. St. Paul appeals to the church of the Corinthians, that he had wrought miracles amongst them, and that they had miraculous gifts conferred upon them by the Holy Spirit.³

16. They were foretold by the prophets, and such as the Jews expected, and had reason to expect from the Messiah. Isaiah speaks of times when miracles should be performed, and of a person who should open the eyes of the blind, and cause the lame to walk, and heal the diseased ; which when Christ performed, he might justly affirm that he was the person promised by the Prophet.⁴ To which must be added all the prophecies which speak of the afflictions and death, and of the triumphant success and everlasting dominion of the Messiah, and were fulfilled in his resurrection, ascension, &c.

17. They were acknowledged by adversaries. Besides the confessions of that kind recorded in the Gospel, and the conversion of enemies, the *Jewish* objection that they were wrought by evil spirits, and the *Gentile* objection that they were effected by magic arts, were a kind of confession that there was in them something preternatural.

18. The same persons, whose miracles stand recorded in the Gospel, foretold also many events ; some of which did not come to pass till a considerable time after the Books of the New Testament were written, and the writers were dead. This confirms the miracles related in those books. We have predictions there of the dispersion of the Jews ; of their continuance as a distinct people ; of the calling of the Gentiles ; of the perpetual duration of Christ's kingdom ; of the fall of its enemies ; of the particular corruptions which should find entrance into the Christian church ; of the spiritual tyranny that should be erected ; &c.

19. If we reflect upon the end and purpose for which these miracles were wrought, we find it grand and noble, full of dignity and majesty. It was, to carry on one vast and consistent plan of Providence, extending itself from the creation to the

³ See *Disc. ii. on the Christ. Relig.*

⁴ Matt. xi. 4. Isai. xxix. 18, 19 ; xxxv. 4, 5, 6 ; lxi. 1 ; xlii. 6, 7 ; liii. 4. Ezek. xxxiv. Luke iv. 17-20.

consummation of all things; to establish a system of belief, hope, and practice, plain and useful; being no other than the religion of nature improved and enforced, revealed in part to the Jews, promised by the Prophets, and tending to destroy four great moral evils, so prevalent and so pernicious, *atheism, scepticism, superstitious idolatry, and vice.*

Compare with these evangelical miracles, the Pagan miracles, as delivered to us by report; or the ecclesiastical miracles, after the church was supported by the state:⁵—but there is no comparison. The latter were usually such as would make fools stare, and wise men suspect; and as they began, so they ended in vain, establishing nothing, or what was worse than nothing; if false, the tricks of deceitful men; if true, the frolics of fantastical demons.

20. Lastly, the supposition that no miracles were wrought in confirmation of the Gospel, is not to be reconciled with the character, behaviour, and patient sufferings of Christ, of his Apostles, and of the Apostolical Christians; or with the propagation of our religion; or with those prophetic parts of the New Testament which have been fulfilled.

Thus far we have given the sum and substance of those arguments, which are usually urged in defence of the miracles recorded in the New Testament. They are the plainest and the most obvious arguments, and consequently the most useful and satisfactory. To these I shall add some proofs which are more remote from common observation, and which perhaps have not been sufficiently considered. *Avia jam solus peragro loca, nullius ante Trita solo.* In few words, the observation which I would offer is this. The miracles of Christ were prophecies at the same time; they were such miracles as in a particular manner suited his character; they were significant emblems of his designs, and figures aptly representing the benefits to be conferred by him upon mankind; and they had in them, if we may so speak, a *spiritual* sense. So much may be urged in behalf of this interpretation of them, as shall probably secure it from being ranked amongst those *fanciful expositions*, which are generally slighted by wise men: for many *cabbalistic notions* have made their appearance in this, as well as in other centuries and countries,

⁵ See Paley's *Evidences*, Pt. I. Pr. ii. c. 2.—EDIT.

which are even beneath censure or mention, and *neither fit for the land, nor yet for the dunghill.*

Our Saviour's miracles were then of a beneficent nature, and such as might be expected from one who came to be an universal blessing. He cast out evil spirits, who by the divine providence were permitted to exert themselves at that time, and to possess many persons. By this he showed that he came to destroy the empire of Satan, and seemed to foretell that, where-soever his doctrine should prevail, idolatry and vice should be put to flight. He foresaw that the great and popular objection to him would be that he was a *magician*; and therefore he confuted it before hand, and ejected evil spirits, to show that he was in no confederacy with them.

The miracle which he first wrought, and which on that account was remarkable, was his turning water into wine at a marriage-feast. There arose in the church, from ancient times, sects of heretics, who condemned wine, and the use of animal food, and marriage; and not only heretics, but the orthodox also ran into extravagant notions of the same kind; crying up celibacy and a solitary life beyond measure, together with rigid and uncommanded austerities and macerations of the body. Christ, therefore, as we may conjecture, was present at this feast, and honoured it with this miracle, that it should stand in the Gospel as a confutation of these foolish errors, and a warning to those who had ears to hear, not to be deluded by such fanatics. St. John, who records this miracle, lived to see these false doctrines adopted and propagated.

He gave sight to the blind;—a miracle well suiting him who brought immortality to light, and taught truth to an ignorant world. *Lucem caliganti reddidit mundo*, applied by Q. Curtius to a Roman emperor, can be strictly applied to Christ, and to him alone. No prophet ever did this miracle before him, as none ever made the religious discoveries which he made. Our Saviour himself leads us to this observation, and sets his miracle in the same view; saying upon that occasion, *I am the light of the world: I am come into this world, that they, which see not, might see.*⁶

He cured the deaf, and the dumb, and the lame, and the

⁶ John ix. 5, 39.

infirm, and cleansed the lepers, and healed all manner of sicknesses, to show at the same time that he was the physician of souls, which have their diseases corresponding in some manner to those of the body, and are deaf and dumb, and impotent, and paralytic, and leprous in the spiritual sense.

He fed the hungry multitudes by a miracle, which aptly represented his heavenly doctrine, and the gospel preached to the poor: and which he himself so explains, saying; *I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.*⁷

The fig-tree, which, with all its fair appearance, was destitute of fruit, and died away at his rebuke, was plainly a figure of the Pharisaical religion, which was only outside show; and of the rejection and fall of the Jewish nation.

At his direction the disciples twice cast the net, and had an astonishing draught of fishes, when without him they had long toiled in vain and caught nothing; an image of the success which they should have when they became *fishers of men*,⁸ as he himself explained it. In the miraculous draught related in *John*⁹ the number of fishes was *one hundred and fifty three*; which, says¹ Sam. Basnage, is the number of the sorts of fishes then known, for Oppian reckons up just so many: and this, adds he, was an indication that persons of all nations and conditions should enter into the church.

His rebuking the winds and waves into silence and peace, may be considered as an emblem of his spiritual victories over the mad rage of Jews and Gentiles; and his walking upon the sea, seems to have been a prelude of the amazing progress of his Gospel, which² crossed the wide ocean, and reached the remotest lands. Popular tumults are often compared to tem-

⁷ John vi. 51.

⁸ Matt. iv. 19.

⁹ John xxi. 11.

¹ *Ann. Eccl.* i. p. 415. What he observes from Oppian is true. See the *Miscell. Observ.* ii. p. 361. The notes on Oppian, there inserted, were written by Jos. Wasse:—το δ' οὐκ ἐπιλήσομαι, ὅφρ' ἂν ἔγωγε Ζωοῖσιν μετέω. That learned man, with two or three others, offered his assistance very kindly to the author of the *Miscell. Observations*, who had not many friends to advise him and to countenance him,—no small discouragements to a young writer, and no bad excuse for the defects in that work.

² To use the words of Pindar, *Nem.* vi. 81:

Πέταται δ' ἐπὶ τε χθόνα καὶ διὰ θαλάσσης τηλόθεν γ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ.

pests and to a troubled sea, and Cicero often mentions *fluctus concionum*, and *fluctus civiles*. Κινήθη δ' ἀγορὴ, ὡς κύματα μακρὰ θαλάσσης, says Homer. So Psalm lxxv. 7. *Who stilleth the noise of the seas, the noise of their waves, and the tumult of the people.*

As, in the Old Testament, God's power is set forth by his commanding the sea to rage, and to be still, and to keep its bounds ; so the dominion, which our Lord exercised over that unruly element, is an indication of the dignity of his nature, and that *by him all things were made* : and none besides himself ever wrought this miracle.³

Some persons have spoken of this miracle, as of one which had the appearance of the least and most ambiguous of Christ's miracles ; because it might have happened by chance, since storms are succeeded by calms, and calms by storms : but they are mistaken. A sudden calm is contrary to the course of nature ; for, in a violent storm, the tossing and rolling of the waves continues after the wind is laid ; and in this miracle, not only the wind fell, but the waters were immediately smoothed. Ἐπετίμησε τῇ θαλάσσῃ καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. Now γαλήνη is a smooth water.⁴

³ See Matt. viii. 23—27 ; xiv. 24—32. Tertullian says, *Cæterum navicula illa figuram ecclesiæ præferebat, quod in mari, id est, seculo, fluctibus, id est, persecutionibus et tentationibus inquietatur, Domino per patientiam veluti dormiente, donec, orationibus sanctorum in ultimis suscitatus, compescat seculum, et tranquillitatem suis reddat* (De Bapt. c. 12). *The little ship, tossed up and down in the sea, represented the Christian church, which suffers affliction and persecution in this world, whilst the Lord sleeps, and seems patiently to overlook it, till, being awakened by the prayers of the saints in the latter days, he shall check the raging world, and restore tranquillity to his servants.* His observation is ingenious.

⁴ Seneca de Tranquil. 2. *Sicut est quidam tremor etiam tranquilli maris, aut lacus, cum ex tempestate requievit.*

De Brev. Vit. 2. *Velut in profundo mari, in quo post ventum quoque volutatio est.*
Herc. Fur. 1089.

Sed ut ingenti

Vexata Noto, servat longos

Unda tumultus, et jam vento

Cessante tumet.

Herc. Oct. 710.

Ut fractus Austro pontus etiamnum tumet,

Quamvis quiescat languidis ventis dies.

Lucan. v. 217.

Ut tumidus Boreæ post flamina pontus

Rauca gemit.

He raised the dead,—a miracle peculiarly suiting him, who at the last day should call forth all mankind to appear before him; and, therefore, when he raised Lazarus, he uttered those majestic words: *I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.*⁵

He performed some miracles upon persons who were not of his own nation; and it was so ordered by Divine Providence, that these persons,—as the Centurion, the Syrophœnician woman, the Samaritan leper,—should show a greater degree of faith and of gratitude, than the Jews to whom the same favours were granted. This was an indication that the Gospel should be more readily received by the Gentiles than by the Jews; and this our Saviour intimates, saying, when he had commended the Centurion's faith, *Many shall come from the east, and from the west, from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into utter darkness.*⁶

He cured some persons at a distance, without visiting and seeing them; to show that he should convert and save, by his sacred word, those who should not see and converse with him here on earth.

The darkness, which was spread over the land, showed the spiritual blindness of the Jews, which continued when the Gospel shone in the Gentile world, and was an omen of their destruction.

The veil of the temple, which was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, portended the abolition of the ceremonial law, and of the separation between Jews and Gentiles, and an entrance for believers by the death of Christ into the Holy of holies.

Statius, *Theb.* vii. 86.

*Ut si quando ruit, debellatasque reliquit
Eurus aquas, pax ipsa tumet, pontumque jacentem
Exanimis jam volvit hiems.*

Claudian, *In Ruf.* i. 70.

*Cœu murmurat alti
Impacata quies pelagi, cum flamine fracto
Durat adhuc sævitque tumor, dubiumque per æstum
Lassa recedentis fluitant vestigia venti.*

⁵ John xi. 25.

⁶ Matt. viii. 11, 12.

The earthquakes at the death and resurrection of Christ, showed the great revolutions which should come to pass in the establishment of the Gospel, and in the fall of Judaism and Paganism ; for in the sacred writers great changes in the political world are foretold and denoted by earthquakes, by shaking heaven and earth, and sea and dry land.

If Christ never wrought a miracle, and his disciples, mean and illiterate persons, feigned all these things, they were extremely ingenious to fix upon miracles, which so exactly suited the character that he assumed ; and amazingly fortunate to invent miracles, which so aptly prefigured events that came to light in later times. We have false legends concerning the miracles of Christ, of his Apostles, and of ancient Christians ; and the writers of these fables had, in all probability, as good natural abilities as the disciples of Christ, and some of them, as the author of the *Recognitions*, wanted neither learning nor craft ; and yet they betray themselves by faults against chronology, against history, against manners and customs, against morality, and against probability. A liar, of this kind, can never pass undiscovered ; but an honest relater of truth and matter of fact is safe ; he wants no artifice and fears no examination : and if the miracles related by him are found to be indications of future and remote events, this circumstance adds no small strength to his testimony.

Of the same prophetic kind was also one of St. Paul's miracles. *At Paphos they found a certain sorcerer, a Jew—Then Paul set his eyes upon him and said, The hand of the Lord is upon thee, and thou shalt be blind for a season.—Then the Deputy, when he saw what was done, believed.*⁷ By this miracle of the Apostle was confirmed the prediction of Christ, *I am come into the world, that they who see not may see, and that they who see may be blind.* The eyes of the wicked Jew are closed, and the understanding of the Pagan Proconsul is illuminated. The one represents the impenitence and the rejection of the Jews, the other the docility and the calling of the Gentiles ; and as the false prophet is only condemned to blindness for a season, so the Jews are to remain in darkness for a certain period, and

⁷ Acts xiii.

to be converted in God's appointed time. Origen therefore, who was ever inclined to judge candidly, and Chrysostom, were of opinion that the punishment, which St. Paul inflicted upon the sorcerer Barjesus, brought him to a sense of his guilt, and to a sincere repentance. And indeed a man must have been hardened to a strange degree, upon whom a double miracle, first of severity, and then of clemency, would have no effect.^s

The miracles, by which St. Paul was instructed and converted, have been thought by some to be of the emblematic and prophetic kind, and to indicate the future calling of the Jews; so that Paul the persecutor, and Paul the Apostle, was a type of his own nation. St. Paul, though the Apostle of the Gentiles, never cast off his care for his own brethren, and always expressed himself on that subject with the warmest affection; and he alone, of the writers of the New Testament, has spoken clearly of the future restoration of the Jews. He earnestly wished for that happy day, and saw it afar off, and was glad. St. Paul was extremely zealous for the Law, and a persecutor of the Christians: so were the Jews. St. Paul, for opposing Jesus Christ, was struck blind, but upon his repentance he received his sight: so were the Jews for their rebellion smitten with spiritual blindness, which shall be removed when they are received again into favour. St. Paul was called miraculously, and by the glorious manifestation of Christ himself, and he was instructed by the same Divine Master: such will perhaps be the conversion and the illumination of the Jews. St. Paul was called last of all the Apostles: the Jews will certainly enter late into the Church. St. Paul was the most active, laborious, and successful of all the disciples: such perhaps the Jews also shall be after their conversion. But these are rather conjectures of what may be, than discoveries of what must come to pass.

Our Saviour foretold that false Christs and false prophets should arise, and show signs and wonders. This somewhat perplexed the ancient Christian writers; but, if the objection had been made to the Apostles, when they first preached the Gospel, they would perhaps have replied:—As to the wonders, which, our Master says, shall be done by false Christs and false

^s See S. Basnage, *Annal.* i. p. 549.

prophets, either upon examination some of those wonders will appear to be tricks and impostures;—or they will not be wrought publicly and before proper witnesses, but will be attested by seditious ruffians, whose oath should not be admitted in any court of judicature;—or they will be wrought to defend something that is manifestly false, and therefore will be of no weight;—or they will be wrought to prove that God will protect and defend the Jews, which will be soon confuted by the destruction of Jerusalem;—or they will not be such miracles as the ancient prophets declared that the Messiah would perform—miracles beneficial to mankind;—or they will not be wrought with a declared purpose to disprove the truth of Christianity, or to establish anything good and commendable; but only to amaze people, and excite them to rebellion;—or they will be wrought at a time when the servants of Christ frequently and openly perform miracles of a more noble and amiable kind; so that it will be impossible for an impartial man not to see on which side the advantage lies;—or they will be wrought by the permission of the Divine Providence, to infatuate and seduce the wicked, reprobate, unbelieving Jews; for though Providence be concerned to take care that no honest person be misled by the miracles of a false prophet, yet God may, by a just judgment, permit evil men and evil spirits to delude those who are abandoned to all wickedness, and who have forfeited his favour and protection. Thus you are forewarned; take heed therefore, that ye be not deceived.

Christ and his Apostles foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, and many other events; and wrought a variety of miracles in confirmation of their own character and authority. False Christs were to arise, showing signs and wonders. Who were these false Christs? Jews, without question. And whom would they deceive? Their own countrymen. And when were they to arise? After the ascension of Christ, when his predictions began to be accomplished, and whilst his disciples were endued with miraculous powers. And what was to be the end of the wonders, real or fictitious, of the false Christs? To incite the Jews to sedition and rebellion, and to persuade them that God would never forsake them. But misery and ruin brake in upon the nation like a torrent, and showed the folly of trusting

in such liars. If for a time these impostors succeeded, and seduced some persons, yet the time was short, and the deluded persons were men devoted to destruction; and so no harm arose from it, either to good men, or to the Gentile world, or to the Gospel of Christ. The destruction of Jerusalem therefore soon decided the controversy between the Christians and the false prophets, and shewed on which side the truth lay, and who had the spirit of God.

Our Saviour says of those impostors, *They shall shew wonders.*⁹ It appears not evidently from these words that they should really work miracles. They shall shew them, that is, they shall pretend it, and make people think so, — truly or falsely, it mattered not; and Christ forbade his followers to regard anything that they should teach, or to take their wonders into consideration, because the event would very soon discover them to be false prophets and pernicious guides, and that was enough.

Concerning the miracles of the Apostles, it is most probable that they could not be performed by them at their own discretion, but only when they had an impulse from the Holy Ghost, who alone knew the proper times and the just occasions. When St. Paul was sent as a prisoner to appear before Cæsar at Rome, it seems to have been expedient for the honour of Christianity, that he should have the reputation of being a holy man, favoured by heaven, who had the spirit of prophecy, and had performed wonderful works; or else Nero, and the courtiers, and the Prætorian guards would have despised him, as a setter forth of strange doctrines, and a fanatic. Therefore the Spirit of God so ordered it, that he foretold the loss of the ship, and the safe landing of all the passengers; and wrought several miracles at Malta, and that kind of miracles which will gain the love and favour of men, namely, healing the sick; and thence was highly respected by Julius, the centurion, who had the care of him, and who, when he delivered his prisoners to the captain of the guard at Rome, informed him, no doubt, of all that had happened in the voyage; — which accounts for the good treatment St. Paul received at court, and for the permission granted him

⁹ Matt. xxiv. 24.

of dwelling in his own hired house, with only one soldier to guard him, and for the converts whom he seems to have made even in Cæsar's household.

Let us now sum up briefly, and in few words, the main evidences of the truth of our religion.

1. Christ was foretold by the prophets. Of the things predicted concerning him, some were miraculous, some improbable, some seemingly irreconcilable, and all of them beyond the reach of human conjecture; and yet in him they all centered and were united and reconciled. To this must be added the amazing harmony, analogy, and correspondence between the Old and New Testament, not only in the direct prophecies, but in the types, rites, ceremonies, and events contained in the former, and fulfilled in a sublimer sense in the latter; which, upon the whole, could never be the effect of blind chance. The Old and New Testament confirm each other: the prophetic parts of the former support the Gospel, and the miracles and prophecies, and success of Christ and his Apostles, support the Old Testament.¹

2. Christ knew the hearts of men, as he showed upon all occasions; a knowledge which Almighty God represents in Scripture as so peculiar to himself, that he cannot be supposed to suffer those to partake of it, who are not sent by him.

3. He was a prophet: he foretold not only things remote and lying beyond human sagacity, but things improbable and miraculous, which have been accomplished.

4. He wrought miracles numerous and various, worthy of himself, and beneficial to men: and many of these miracles were

¹ The authenticity of the books of the New Testament stands confirmed by many proofs internal and external, some of which we have already represented; and the truth of the facts and doctrines, contained in those books, must be established by the same arguments which shew the truth of Christianity. *We know the Scriptures to be the word of God*, say some persons, *because the Spirit tells us so*. But how will you convince us that you have the Spirit? and what is the rule by which we may distinguish your pretensions from fanaticism? When a man carefully examines the arguments for the divine authority of the Scriptures, and sees the force of them, and assents to them, he may reasonably conclude that the Holy Spirit has assisted him; but his belief, though thus assisted, is grounded upon evidence, upon inferences justly drawn from just premises; and faith must be founded upon reason, or it must be fanatical credulity. There is no medium.

also prophecies at the same time, and indications of future events; and so were most of his parables.

5. He never erred or failed in any point, as teacher, prophet, Messiah, or worker of miracles. All his promises were accomplished, particularly his remarkable promise that he would support and comfort all those who should be called to suffer and to die for his sake, which has been illustriously fulfilled in ancient and in modern martyrs.

6. He conferred miraculous and prophetic gifts on his disciples, and they on theirs.

7. His religion was plain and popular, yet pure and holy, and tending to make men wiser and better; and it has produced a multitude of good effects in the world.

8. When it was first preached, it could never have made its way without the assistance of miracles.

9. He lived and died an example of all that he taught, of all active and suffering virtues.

10. He had no rival or antagonist, to make his authority appear doubtful, by opposing prophecies to his prophecies, and miracles to his miracles, from the time that he began his ministry to this day.

It cannot be supposed that there should be any deceit in this complicated evidence, and that falsehood should boast of all the imaginable characters of truth.

A learned and ingenious person, but inclined to scepticism, said once to a friend, "You often tell us how dangerous it is to reject the Gospel, if it be true; but you consider not that there is the same danger in teaching it, if it be false. What can you say for yourselves when you come to appear before God, if you have misled the people in so important a point?" His friend replied, "We will suppose, if you please, that Christianity is not a divine revelation: let us consider the consequence. The consequence is that Deism is the only true religion; and these are its great articles: One God, the immortality of the soul, or its permanency so long as it shall please God, a future state of retribution, the eternal differences of moral good and evil, an obligation to love God and man, and to live righteously and soberly. All these points are forcibly inculcated by Christianity, and nothing is taught by us that invalidates them. If Christianity

be not true, we have been deluded, and have thought too well of those who introduced revealed religion into the world; and that is all. The delusion hath led us into no iniquity, and authorised no crimes: it has been the most innoxious of all errors, an error pleading for every virtue, and dissuading from every vice. What danger can there be in such a religion, even upon any supposition? and how can it be imagined that the Father of mercies would not forgive such an error? If Christianity be true, the Deist is in an error; and if his error be unavoidable, he is in the hands of a merciful God: but let him take heed that he deceive not himself, for if his unbelief arises from evil causes, *God is not mocked.*"

III. *On the alleged Miracles of the 2nd and 3rd Centuries.*—As far as the subsequent miracles, mentioned by Christian writers, fall short of the distinguishing characters belonging to the works of Christ and his apostles; so far they must fail of giving us the same full persuasion and satisfaction. That they fall short in many instances, will appear to any one who shall examine them by the characters which we have enumerated above. I shall only observe: 1. They were not foretold by the prophets. 2. They were not wrought by prophets. 3. They contained in them no prophetic indications of future events. 4. No man ever laid down his life, or ever suffered distress and persecution, in attestation of them.

Though this be an inquiry proper for those who have learning, leisure, and abilities; yet Christians at present are under no particular obligation to form any notion at all about the subject, any more than about many other things contained in the writings of the Fathers, upon which Christianity cannot be said to depend. It were to be wished that the defenders of these miracles would remember that the dispute is not *pro aris et focis*, and that the truth of Christianity is out of the question.

If we admit the miracles of Christ and of his apostles, we must not, when we examine the subsequent miracles, bring along with us a prejudice against them, from their own nature, and as they are acts surpassing human power. Since they are not impossibilities and imply no contradiction, they are to be examined like other facts; with this difference, that they require a stronger confirmation. But there is in the heart of many persons a bent

to an opinion concerning things preternatural, amounting nearly to this proposition, *What we never saw, cannot be true*. This bent has seldom been more prevailing than in our age, and it is the business of Reason to correct it; since it may mislead us as much as credulity.

In examining these later miracles, we must consider their nature, the end for which they appear to have been performed, their tendency, the effects which they produced, and the credibility of the witnesses. In this inquiry we shall find it scarcely possible to arrive at absolute certainty: of probability there is a variety of degrees; and a high degree of probability is sufficient to require and justify our assent, and differs little from certainty. As the probability is more or less, such must be the credit which we give to it. If the case be perplexed, we are not to form any judgment besides *NON LIQUET*. Doubt and suspense are then commendable; and God has so ordered it, that many of our inquiries must end thus, to teach us at least modesty and humility.

The Christians of the second and third centuries, from Justin Martyr downwards, affirm that miracles were from time to time wrought amongst them. Their consent in this seems to have been uniform and unanimous; which cannot be said for many of the miracles after Constantine, which, though received by the greater number, were suspected or rejected by some.

The general good character of these ancient Christians, which yet is always to be understood with some exceptions; their low and afflicted state; their pious behaviour under it; their want of a divine support and encouragement to keep them constant to their profession; their remote situation from each other in various parts of the known world; their great numbers, and their success in converting multitudes; their open appeals to the Pagans in their apologies, and the knowledge which the Pagans probably had of those appeals; the persons who attest these things, some of whom were confessors, and martyrs, others learned, ingenious, and of a fair character; incline us to think that miracles did not entirely cease in those times, and that Christians could not combine together in carrying on impostures, or be able to impose them upon those whom they had converted, or be imposed upon themselves by dishonest brethren. It is strange that they should have been able to maintain so good a

reputation as they did amongst the more moderate and unprejudiced Pagans, and have had the success amongst them which they had, if they were so disposed to forging, and to defending forged miracles.

According to the accounts which the writers of the second and third centuries have given us of these miracles, it appears, not that they were performed in an absurd and superstitious way, but usually by plain and religious, and apostolical methods, as by prayer and invocation of Jesus; nor does it appear that they were usually wrought for lucre, or to vest extraordinary authority in any person, or to augment the power of the clergy, or to decide religious controversies, or to run down anything called heresy and heterodoxy, or to establish any new doctrine, or to encourage and recommend voluntary and foolish austerities, a solitary life, vows of celibacy and virginity, worshipping of wood, rags, and bones, invocation of saints, &c. If a man, moved by these reasons, and by reverence to the ancient Christians, should assent to the miracles attested by them, he ought not to be slighted, insulted, and ridiculed for it, by those who have the same faith and hope, and acknowledge the same Lord and master.

Such are the arguments in favour of the miracles of the second and third centuries; to which, on the other hand, is objected the credulity of many of the Christians, the enthusiastic temper of others, the disingenuousness of some of them in the matter of pious frauds; a disposition which Christians had in common with other people to admit too easily anything that favoured their own cause, and an unwillingness to oppose it; the forgeries of books, epistles, edicts, and reports, contrived by some of them, and received by others; the accounts of the miracles, which seem often founded upon hearsays and tradition; and many miracles notoriously and undeniably false, which are confidently reported by fathers and writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, who made no conscience of affirming the most childish absurdities in the marvellous way. To these objections may be added the force of imagination, and of a strong persuasion, which may have a strange and surprising effect in removing some bodily disorders, so that the cure shall be thought preternatural both by the person who is relieved, and by those who have contributed to his recovery, and by those who are present; and yet

they may be all deceived, and all innocent of any design to impose upon mankind. Such seems to be the case mentioned by Minucius Felix concerning evil spirits, who being adjured, *vel exsiliunt statim, vel evanescunt gradatim, prout fides patientis adjuvat, vel gratia curantis adspirat*²: for it is hardly to be supposed that miracles of this kind are wrought by halves, and by slow degrees.

It may be farther observed, that the miracles, mentioned by the apologists and ancient Fathers of the second and third centuries, are usually healing the sick, and casting out evil spirits; miracles in which there is room for some error and deception. We hear nothing of causing the blind to see, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, the lepers to be cleansed. Add to this, that notions of³ morality have in some points varied in the Christian world, and been more or less strict in different times and places. The writing of books or epistles under borrowed names, and imposing them as genuine upon the public, is a thing of bad consequence and an immorality; yet hath it been done by men who perhaps in other respects were honest. Writers of the fourth and fifth centuries have attested miracles which either they knew to be false, or did not know to be true; and yet many of them, in all probability, would have died rather than have renounced Christianity, and for no reward in the world would have borne false witness in a trial. There have been Christians who have readily fought duels upon slender occasions, and for a point of honour, and who would as readily have died for their religion.

Men will be inclined to determine this controverted question according to their preconceived notions, and their accustomed way of thinking; for there appears to be a sort of fatality in opinions of this kind, which, when once taken up, are seldom laid down. But upon the whole, the arguments seem to preponderate a little on the side of the ancient opinion, so as to incline us to suppose that miracles were sometimes wrought amongst the Christians, though at present it may be no easy

² Min. F. Oct. c. 27.

³ De tout tems, je n'en excepte que les temps apostoliques, les Evêques se sont crus autorisés à user de ces fraudes pieuses qui tendent au salut des hommes. Les ouvrages supposés en sont une preuve, et la facilité avec laquelle les Pères ajoutaient foi à ces mauvais ouvrages, fait voir que s'ils n'étoient pas complices de la fraude, ils n'étoient pas scrupuleux à en profiter.—Beausobre Hist. de Manich. ii. 756.

matter to point them out distinctly. Thus much may seem probable;—that in the second and third centuries some sick persons were restored to health by the prayers of their brethren; that some virtuous pagans had their doubts and prejudices removed, and were called to Christianity, by divine impulses, dreams, or visions; and that the martyrs and confessors received an extraordinary assistance from God, enabling them to undergo horrible tortures and sufferings with amazing patience and constancy; which divine assistance, whether it may properly be called *miraculous*, it matters not much to inquire, for we will not dispute about words.

Whilst the church of Christ was subject to insults and persecution from the Pagan powers, and in a low and distressed condition, the Christians assembled together as often as they could, and took all possible care to instruct, and animate, and comfort, and relieve one another. When any of them were sick, the congregation prayed for them, and the Presbyters visited them, and invoked the name of the Lord over them. Many of them recovered, and the recovery was accounted miraculous, and perhaps was oftentimes really, and sometimes evidently so. It is impossible to show that it was unworthy of the divine power thus to exert itself for the consolation of the afflicted Christians, and for an evidence that God was with them of a truth. Great things are said in the Scriptures concerning the efficacy of prayer, to whose persuasive force may be applied what Pindar hath so elegantly feigned of music and poesy,

Καὶ τὸν αἰχματὰν κεραυνὸν σβεννύεις
'Αενδὸν πυρός.⁴

⁴ As the doctrines of divine influences upon the mind of man, and of the efficacy of prayer, are connected with the doctrine of a *particular providence*, let us produce a few remarks on this subject, made by ingenious men who never passed for enthusiasts.

“Some thoughts and designs may be caused by the suggestion and impulse, or other silent communications, of some spiritual being; perhaps, *the Deity* himself. For that such imperceptible influences and still whispers may be, none of us all can positively deny: that is, we cannot know certainly, that there are no such things. On the contrary, I believe there are but few of them who have made observations upon themselves and their affairs, but must, when they reflect on life past, and the various adventures and events of it, find many instances in which their usual judgment and sense of things cannot but seem to themselves to have been *over-ruled* they knew not *by what*, nor *how*, nor *why*; i. e. they have done things which after-

After Constantine, the miracles become extremely suspicious, from their own frivolous or extravagant nature, or wards they wonder how they came *to do* : and that these actions have had consequences very *remarkable* in their history. I speak not here of men dementated with wine, or enchanted with some temptation : the thing holds true of men even in their sober and more considering seasons.

“That there may be *possibly* such inspirations of new thoughts and counsels, may perhaps further appear from this ; that we so frequently find thoughts arising in our heads, into which we are led by *no* discourse, *nothing* we read, *no* clue of reasoning ; but they surprise and come upon us from we *know not* what quarter. If they proceeded from the mobility of spirits straggling out of order, and fortuitous affections of the brain, or were of the nature of *dreams*, why are they not as wild, incoherent, and extravagant as *they* are ? Not to add, that the world has generally acknowledged, and therefore seems to have *experienced*, some assistance and directions given to good men by the Deity ; that men have been many times infatuated, and lost to themselves, &c. If any one should object, that if men are thus overruled in their actings, then they are deprived of their *liberty*, &c. ; the answer is, that though man is a free agent, he may not be free as to *everything*. His freedom may be restrained, and he only accountable for those acts in respect of which he is *free*.

“If this then be the case, as it seems to be, that men’s minds are susceptible of such *insinuations* and *impressions*, as frequently, by ways unknown, do affect them, and give them an inclination towards this or that ; how many things may be brought to pass by these means without *fixing* and *refixing* the laws of nature, any more than they are unfixed when one man alters the opinion of another by throwing a book, proper for his purpose, in his way ? I say, how many things may be brought about thus, not only in regard of *ourselves*, but *other people*, who may be concerned in our actions, either *immediately*, or *in time* through perhaps many intermediate events ? For the prosperity or improsperity of a man, or his fate here, does not entirely depend upon his *own* prudence or imprudence, but in a great measure upon his *situation* among the rest of mankind, and what they do. The natural effect of his management meeting with such things, as are the natural effects of the actions of other men, and being blended with them, the result may be something not intended or foreseen.”—*Wollaston’s Rel. of Nat.*, sect. v. p. 106.

These things, according to the light of reason, are not improbable, and, as our author observes, no man can prove the contrary : but whilst we acknowledge the gracious influences of Providence in everything that tends to make us better and wiser and happier, we must be very careful to keep the sober mean between the extremes ; the one of excluding the Divine interposition in the natural and moral world ; the other of destroying human agency, or of ascribing the wild fancies of our own heads to the suggestions of the Holy Spirit.

Le Clerc, giving an account of *An Essay on Divine Providence*, by Robert Burrow, says,

“Besides a general providence, this author shews that there are extraordinary occasions where God interposes in a particular manner ; as he did formerly by miracles and by prophecies, and as he has done since by particular interpositions, which we cannot, properly, call miracles. It is very probable, not to say certain, that God can interpose, and that he does interpose now, as well as formerly, in

their apparent bad tendency, or many other circumstances which I shall not here examine. I mean not by this that Providence never interposed in behalf of the Christian cause. The defeat of Julian's attempt to rebuild the Temple may justly be ascribed to a particular providence. Monkery, and the immoderate veneration of saints and martyrs; and Christianity somewhat adulterated with Paganism; and the spirit of wrangling and of oppression, and religious con-

extraordinary cases, though we perceive it not, because we are not forewarned that it shall be so. Things happen which seem not to be according to the ordinary course of nature, but by a particular intervention of the Deity, though God does not give us previous notice of it, as he did when he established the Mosaic and the Christian religion. God has commanded us to call upon him, and has promised to grant us whatsoever is proper for us. And who can doubt of his fulfilling these promises! Let us suppose that a good man, and a man whose welfare is very necessary to his family, which he has educated religiously, is in great danger of dying by a distemper, and that his family earnestly prays to God for his recovery. Is it not possible that they may by their supplications obtain from God the life and the health of this man, which else he would not have granted? Upon the supposition that his disease was mortal, and that without these prayers God would not have removed it, this would be a real miracle. In like manner, everything that God gives to those who pray to him, and would not else give them, is a miracle, though we perceive it not, because we know not beforehand that it shall be so.

"In the number of these providential interpositions, supposing the fact to be true, might be placed what happened on the coasts of Holland and Zealand, the 14th of July, 1672. The United Provinces having ordered public prayers to God, when they feared that the French and English fleets would make a descent upon their coasts, it came to pass, that when these fleets waited only for the tide to land their smaller vessels, it was retarded, contrary to its usual course, for twelve hours, which disappointed the design; so that the enemies were obliged to defer it to another opportunity, which they never found, because of a storm that arose afterwards, and drove them from the coast.

"A thing of this nature, happening at such a juncture to save the country from ruin, was accounted miraculous, and a prediction of it would have proved it to have been so. However, as nothing falls out without the concurrence of the Divine Providence, there was great reason to return thanks to God for the deliverance. In the history of other nations, events of this kind are recorded, which, if they had been foretold, must have been accounted real miracles."—*Le Clerc*, Bibl. A. et M. xxvi. 391.

Nec dubito quin etiamnum hodie Deus, precibus piorum permotus, multa occulte mutet in animis et corporibus, qua mutatione averruncet ab hominibus religiosis magnas calamitates, quæ iis alioqui contingerent. Multa operatur, quæ res nobis faciunt secundiores, et veritati, nobis insciis, prosunt; quamvis talia sub oculos non cadant. Sunt hæc vera miracula, sed Dei sese occultantis, etiam iis, in quorum gratiam hoc facit. Quare semper nos oportet ad Deum precibus confugere, et omnium eorum, quæ nobis secunda eveniunt, gratias ei agere; quamvis Deus sua illa occulta auxilia non venditet.—*Clericus ad Isai.* xlv. 15.

troversies imprudently and indecently carried on by all parties ; and false miracles, and feigned visions ; came hand in hand, and prevailed too much.

There have been some, and there are many persons, who, *believing the truth of Christianity*, doubt of the miracles after the Apostolical age, or reject them. Such were *Van Dale*⁵ and

⁵ Van Dale has not declared himself fully of that opinion : but he rejected all the Pagan accounts of magicians, incantations, prophecies, oracles, and miracles ; and he gave no credit to the ejections of demons after the age of the apostles and of the apostolical men, and to the stories which the Fathers have related concerning demoniacs. He observes, that in the days of the apostles the gift of casting out evil spirits, like other miraculous powers, was conferred upon a *few* persons, and to them only for *great* and *special* purposes ; whence he concludes, against Tertullian and others, that in the subsequent ages *every Christian* could not have been endued with this power. According to his system, demons not being any longer permitted to take possession of human bodies, there was no occasion for exorcists. Every example of this kind, which might have been alleged, he would either have called in question as not well attested, or would have ascribed to a divine power and to good angels.

In Gerard Brant's *History of the Reformation*, it is related that, in the year 1566, the boys and girls, who were educated in the charity-school at Amsterdam, were possessed with evil spirits, and agitated and tormented to such a degree as to feel the ill effects of it all their lives after ; and that during this disorder they spake new languages, and revealed the secret counsels and designs carried on against the Protestants. Upon which Van Dale thus delivers his opinion :—*Historiam hanc revera contigisse minime nego. Verum enimvero unde habent hi, prudentes alias et sinceri scriptores, hæc diaboli, in his pueris supernaturali modo operantis, opera atque effecta fuisse ? Nam si hic aliquid super aut præternaturale statuendum, considerandum est, minime pueros illos, diabolica quadam malignitate, in homines quosvis involasse, ipsosve pulsasse aut lacerasse, aliisve maniacorum furoribus incensos ulla mala perpetrasse, dum ipsi tam dira paterentur ; sed ex adverso, mirabilia multa, de rebus præsentibus et plane occultis, manifestasse, ac quidem talia, quæ Protestantibus, qui tunc premebantur summis angustiis, utilia possent esse ac salutaria contra persecutores, qui omni astu Diabolico et crudelitate ipsos dispergere ac disperdere conabantur. Pietati certe ac rectæ rationi, ipsique Sacræ Scripturæ, malorumque istorum temporum statui, longe magis convenit, talia nos providentiæ Divinæ Majestatis attribuire, ut quæ in illis rerum angustiis, per talia, ut sibi caverent, piis ac probis Reformatæ vitæ et doctrinæ hominibus auxilio esse voluit.* (Dissert. de Idol.)

Van Dale, a man not inclined to credulity, a scholar, and a physician, moved by the authority of wise and worthy persons, and candid historians, was willing to admit the fact, and inclined to account it preternatural. He will not allow it to have been by the operation of evil demons ; and yet, on the contrary, there are reasons, though he takes no notice of them, to think that a good spirit would not afflict children in such a manner : and therefore some will be of opinion that the case of these young persons was a bodily disorder, and a species of enthusiastic madness, exaggerated by the first relaters and by common fame.

A reformation is seldom carried on without a heat and a vehemence which

Moyle; and also *Le Clerc*, who yet was not so far fixed in that opinion, as to think it improbable that miracles were wrought in the beginning of the second century. To these authors will it be permitted to add *Middleton*? He declared himself more than once in favour of revelation. Let us therefore err, if it be an error, on the side which is favourable to him and to his memory, and join him to these ingenious and learned men. His system was treated by some persons as *a novelty*: but they should have said, *As far as we know*; for be it right, or be it wrong, it certainly is not new.

“When the truth of our religion,” says *Moyle*, “had been confirmed by so many signal miracles, which were never disowned by the heathens themselves, it quickly triumphed over all opposition, and spread with a wonderful progress over all the parts of the Roman empire. When Christianity had gained such a footing in the world, the work was half done, and the rest might be safely trusted to the preaching of our ministers, and the suffering of our martyrs; and the ends of miracles being

borders upon enthusiasm; and as *Cicero* has observed that there never was a great man *sine afflatu divino*, so in times of religious contests, there seldom was a man very zealous for liberty, civil and evangelical; and a declared and active enemy to insolent tyranny, blind superstition, political godliness, bigotry, and pious frauds; who had not a fervency of zeal which led him, on some occasions, somewhat beyond the sober bounds of temperate reason. When men are thus disposed, and have animated each other, and are inflamed by opposition, persecution, and ill usage, they are strongly inclined to expect a Divine interposition, and to explain every strange appearance that way. The impetuosity spreads far and wide, and seizes even upon children.

But as to the fact before us, I leave it, as I have some other points, undecided, to the judgment of the reader. Many stories of this kind, but not so well attested, have been related concerning the Protestants in *Dauphiné* and the *Cevennes*. It is said, amongst other strange things, that one of them, to prove himself a prophet, ordered a pile to be made and kindled, and stood unhurt for a quarter of an hour in the midst of the fire, whilst the flames surrounded him on all sides, and made an arch over his head; and that more than twelve hundred persons were present and spectators of the miracle. See *Le Théâtre Sacré des Cevennes*, by *Misson*; which he wrote to defend the cause of the *French prophets* here in England. But these prophets were at last put, not out of countenance (for such people never blush), but put to flight, when they had failed of their promise to raise a dead man, and had fallen out amongst themselves. Vid. *Act. Erud.* 1708, p. 137, et 1714, p. 89. There will, in all probability, be a succession of such kind of persons in every age, and in one part or other of the Christian world, not exactly alike, nor yet very different:—

Facies non omnibus una,

Nec diversa tamen: qualem decet esse sororum.

fully accomplished, it was high time for miracles themselves to cease, for God Almighty never wastes them in vain. This notion I take to be very agreeable to the general sense of the Protestant divines, and for this reason I give little credit to any miracles since the days of the Apostles. I am loath, I confess, to reject all without reserve, for the sake of a very remarkable one which happened at the rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem, under Julian; which is so extraordinary in all its circumstances, and so fully attested, that I don't see with what forehead any man can question the truth of it. Though the primitive Christians in general lived up to the full rules of their religion with the utmost probity and innocence of manners; yet it is too certain that there were some persons amongst them, who, through a mistaken zeal, made no scruple of lying for the honour of their religion. Their fictions found an easy reception in a credulous age, and were conveyed down to posterity as certain truths. I am not so uncharitable as to charge the faults and follies of particular men on the whole body of the Christian writers. On the contrary, I think them the persons chiefly imposed on; and that the far greater part of the fictions, which appear in the authors of the three first centuries, were not wilful lies of their own invention, but mistakes flowing from an easy credulity, and warm sallies of zeal that would not suffer them over-nicely to examine the authority of some facts, which they thought would serve for the advancement of their cause.”⁶

Le Clerc was inclined to the same opinion, as appears from many passages in his writings.⁷ In his Ecclesiastical History, speaking of the miracles related by Irenæus, he concludes: *quibus quidem nemo fidem prorsus negare sustineat; sed tamen quæcumque boni viri, ab aliis audita et facile credita, iis temporibus quibus credulitas virtus habebatur, narrabant, vera propterea esse consequens non est. In honorem Dei salutemque*

⁶ Vol. ii. pp. 100, 289.

⁷ See *Bibl. Anc. et Mod.* xxvii. p. 175. In his *Bibl. Chois.* xiii. p. 179, there are *Remarks on Fontenelle, &c.* Le Clerc gave this as a foundling; but it looks very much like his own child, and in all probability it must be laid to him, as well as the *Letters on Inspiration*, which as he never owned, so he never denied. He there endeavours to prove that the ejecting of devils by the Christians after the apostolical age, and the wonders of that kind done by the sign of the cross, deserve no credit.

hominum hyperbolica oratione uti nemo tunc temporis religioni ducebat.

Le Clerc gives some account in his *Bibliothèques*, of the life and writings of Van Dale, and of the works of Moyle. Of the former he says, "His conversation was lively and entertaining, and he delivered his sentiments without reserve. Sworn enemy to superstition and hypocrisy, he ridiculed them openly; which hurt him, as I have been told, on some occasions. He died physician to the poor and to the hospital of Haarlem, which office he exercised with great application and assiduity, though he was extremely attached to his studies." After speaking favourably of Moyle's works, particularly of his dissertation against *the Thundering Legion*, and recommending them to all lovers of truth, he adds: "I have heard this learned and worthy man censured, as one who was inclined to free-thinking and unbelief: but in his writings I can discern nothing that tends that way, and therefore, till I see evident proofs of it, I shall always think that great injustice is done to the character of a person of his penetration and abilities." Le Clerc himself fared no better than Moyle, and *heretic* and *free-thinker* were compliments often paid to him, and to which he was accustomed;—which made him the more disposed to defend his fellow-sufferers.

The Christian miracles may be referred to four periods. The first period contains those which are recorded in the New Testament, and reaches to about A. D. 70. Of these there can be no doubt among Christians. The next period may be of thirty-seven years, and ends about A. D. 107. There is reason to think it probable that some miracles were then performed by those who preached and planted the Gospel in Pagan countries. The third reaches from thence to Constantine. For some of the miracles in these ages, in the second and third centuries, so much may be alleged as should restrain us from determining too positively against them, and denying them all. The last period is from Constantine to where you please, and abounds with miracles, the defence of which shall be left to those who are inclined to undertake it, at the hazard of misapplying their pains. One sort of miracle seems to have been much wanted, and that was to cast the *Romantic Devil* out of the Christians of those times; but *this kind goeth not out* so easily, and stands in

awe of no exorcisms. Some few miracles indeed are said to have been wrought in the days of Constantine, and in remote regions where the Gospel was then first propagated, which, though for certain reasons one cannot rely upon them, yet may require a suspense of judgment.

If it be asked when miraculous powers ceased in the Church, the proper answer seems to be, that these miracles cease to us, when we cease to find satisfactory evidence for them.

Some of the post-Apostolical miracles shall be considered in the course of this work, and what may be fairly urged in their favour shall not be omitted; but it may not be amiss to declare, once for all, that I would not engage for the truth of any of them, after A. D. 107; and that I desire to be ranked, as to this point, not amongst the *deniers* and *rejectors*, but amongst the *doubters*.

Eusebius⁸ relates that *Abgarus*,⁹ prince of Edessa, in Mesopotamia, wrote to Christ, and received a letter from him; and that Thaddæus was sent to Edessa, who cured this prince, wrought other miracles, and converted his people. Eusebius translated this account, or got it translated, from the archives of Edessa. There is no room to suspect him of forging it, but there is abundant reason to account it a forgery; and a foolish one too. Many indeed have received and defended it, from Ephraim Syrus down to Cave, and to writers of yesterday; but if they were twice or ten times as many, their united labours can never efface its indelible characters of puerility and improbability.¹

However, though this be a mere fable, and though Eusebius was to blame for not testifying a dislike or a doubt of it, yet there are some things implied in it concerning Edessa which

⁸ Euseb. H. E. i. 13.

⁹ The letter of *Abgarus* to our Lord, and the reply, have not been without their advocates; and among them are Dr. Cave, and Grabe, in his *Spicilegium*. They are manifestly to be numbered, however, with those pious frauds, of which both the orthodox and the heretics unscrupulously availed themselves in the beginning of the second century. Had they been genuine, it is scarcely possible that the explicit testimony afforded by them to the divinity of Christ could have been overlooked in the Arian controversy. Jortin has estimated their full value, in admitting them as evidence to the early success of the Christian religion in Mesopotamia. *Abgarus* was the common title of the Toparchs of Edessa (Procop. B. Pers. ii. 12), as *Pharaoh* was that of the sovereigns of Egypt.—EDIT.

¹ See Le Clerc, *Hist. Eccl.* p. 332.

cannot fairly be denied: as, that the Gospel was preached there long before the time of Eusebius; and that it was preached when Christianity was in a low and afflicted condition, when neither worldly hope, nor fear, nor the vanity of imitating great nations, nor any motive of that kind, could induce this people to receive it. It will, therefore, be no easy matter to account for their conversion, unless by supposing that the preaching, and the miracles, of some Christians prevailed with them to leave their own religion delivered to them by their ancestors. This happened in all probability in early times; and those *dwellers in Mesopotamia*, who were in Jerusalem at Pentecost, and heard the Apostles speak with tongues, might assist in planting the Gospel at Edessa, or in preparing the way for it.

It is an ancient, and not an improbable tradition, that the Ethiopian Eunuch preached and spread the Gospel in his own country.² Eusebius, speaking of the successors of the Apostles, at the latter end of the first and the beginning of the second century, says, that several at that time went into various and remote countries, converting multitudes, and working many miracles. The words of Eusebius intimate that he thought those extraordinary powers to be, at least, not very common afterwards. *They went about*, says he, *with God's co-operating grace, for EVEN THEN the divine Spirit performed many miracles by them.*³ It were to be supposed, though Eusebius had not said it, that these Evangelists and Apostolical men, and founders of uncorrupted Christianity in various places, had the power of working miracles, to introduce themselves to strangers, and to conciliate their regard and respect; and, indeed, without such credentials, it is difficult to be conceived how *Disciples of the Apostles* could have succeeded in their attempts. It would have been very natural for the Pagans, when they had heard their story, to have said to them, "If Christ and his Apostles not long ago wrought such wonders, as you relate, to convert men, we

² Irenæus iii. 12 : *Ipse Eunuchus credens,—missus est in regiones Æthiopiæ, predicaturus hoc quod ipse crediderat.* Cyrillus Hieros. *Catech.* xvii. p. 204 : *Philippus docuit Æthiopem et baptizavit, atque in Æthiopiam usque Christi præconem misit.* Hieronymus in *Esai.* c. 53 : *Eunuchus—Apostolus genti Æthiopum missus est.*

³ Euseb. H. E. iii. 37. σὺν τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτι καὶ συνεργίᾳ· ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πνεύματος εἰσέτι τότε δ' αὐτῶν πλείσται παράδοξοι δυνάμεις ἐνήργουν.

have reason to expect some from you ; for you tell us that some of these powers were communicated to the disciples of the Apostles. How comes it to pass then that *you* are without them ? and if you have them not, why do you address yourselves to us ? ” What could they do amongst strangers, without miracles, without force, without singular dexterity and subtilty, without the aid of arts and sciences ? Will you suppose the people, to whom they went, to have been colts and wild asses ? And yet, if they were, stupidity and stubbornness often go together.

We read in the Acts of the Apostles that many of the persons converted by the Apostles, on receiving Christianity, received *extraordinary gifts* ; whence it is reasonable to think that they were also enabled, when they went about preaching the Gospel, to confirm it by signs and wonders at some times, and on some occasions. Else they would have done better in staying at home, lest they should discredit their cause by having no power of this kind, when they wanted it most. Le Clerc would have been of the same opinion, if he had considered this point more particularly ; for he says, *The Christian Church not only supported itself, but increased considerably during the second century, by means of the miracles which the last Disciples of the Apostles still wrought.*⁴

The Pagans indeed, at that juncture, wanted the testimony of miracles more than the Jews ; for this reason :—that the Jews had the predictions of their own prophets, and saw or might see the completion of many of them in the person of Christ ; but the Pagans would be less affected by that argument, till they were better acquainted with the history of the Jews, and of their sacred Books. He who in those early times preached to the Jews, might also appeal to the miracles of Christ and of the Apostles, which they or their fathers had seen : but the remoter Gentiles were strangers to these things, and a few sensible proofs of the extraordinary powers of the Holy Spirit would to them have been more satisfactory.

We have not any pretence to reject the testimony of Eusebius as to the fact, that the Gospel was preached by disciples of the

⁴ Bibl. A. et M. vi. p. 336.

Apostles; and we have this to confirm it, that, according to all ancient history, Christianity, after the death of the Apostles, continued to increase and to get ground in various regions.

This brings the probability of miracles down to the beginning of the second century; in the middle of which Justin Martyr says, *there are prophetic gifts amongst us* EVEN UNTIL NOW;⁵ and amongst these gifts he reckons up miraculous powers, as *healing the sick, casting out evil spirits, &c.* His words imply an opinion that such gifts were not only exercised in his time, but had been *continued down* to his time, and he may be justly supposed to speak the sense of his contemporary Christians; and that is all that I cite him for.

It seems probable, that if we had a full and authentic history of the propagation of the Gospel, from the time of the Apostles to the middle of the second century, composed by eye-witnesses and by the preachers of the Christianity, we should find miracles wrought for the conversion of the Pagans. But from A. D. 70, to 150, is a dark interval; and we have very short accounts of the transactions of those days, unless we should accept of groundless rumours and frivolous tales.

VIII.—ON THE STORY OF ST. JOHN'S MARTYRDOM.

ST. JOHN was banished by Domitian, A. D. 94. Tertullian, and others upon his credit, say that he was put into a vessel of boiling oil; which story Jerome repeats with a few embellishments of his own.⁶ The Apostle came out *unhurt*, says Tertullian. He came out *stronger and healthier* than he went in, says Jerome; who perhaps had in his thoughts *Æson* coming out of *Medea's kettle*:—

Barba comæque,
Canitie posita, nigrum rapuere colorem :
Pulsa fugit macies : abeunt pallorque situsque,
Adjectoque cavæ supplentur sanguine venæ ;
Membraque luxuriant. Æson miratur, et olim
Ante quaterdenos hunc se reminiscitur annos.⁷

Eusebius not only mentions not this *tradition* in his *Eccl. History* or in his *Chronicon*, but in his *Demonstratio Evangelica*,

⁵ Inst. M. D. Tryph. c. 82. παρὰ γὰρ ἡμῶν καὶ μέχρι νῦν προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἔστιν.

⁶ See Le Clerc, *Hist. Eccl.* p. 508.

⁷ Ovid. Met. vii. 288.

speaking of the sufferings of the Apostles, of the death of Stephen, of James the brother of John, of James the brother of Christ, of Peter and of Paul, he only says of John, Ἰωάννης τε νήσῳ παραδίδοται, *John is banished and sent into an island.*⁸

Christ had said to James and John, *Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with;*⁹ which possibly gave occasion to the invention of this punishment. The *caldron* (as a kind of *scyphus Herculeus*) represented *the cup*, and the *oil* the *baptism*; especially as oil was used in baptism in the days of Tertullian. The anointing of the baptised person began about his time. It was not practised when Justin Martyr wrote, as appears from the account which he has given of this religious rite; and the story of St. John's *caldron* might be made in Tertullian's days, to represent a *figurative* or *metaphorical cup*, and *baptism* of *afflictions* and *martyrdom*.¹

Tertullian had no small share of credulity. He proves that the soul is *corporeal*, from the visions of an *illuminated sister*, who told him that she had seen a soul.² He affirms roundly,³ that a fine city was seen for forty days suspended in the air over Jerusalem. This report of some crazy pilgrim or idle stroller, he adopted as a proof that the *Millennium* was at hand. How can one depend upon his testimony, in things that are of the preternatural and marvellous kind?⁴

St. John is called a *martyr* by some ancient Christians; and so he was, when he was banished to an island, and suffered *pœnam capitalem*.

IX. ON THE APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.

AMONGST the ancient Christian books which claim our attention are the *Apostolical Constitutions*, which, if they are genuine, are a sacred treatise, and of equal authority with the New

⁸ Euseb. D. Ev. iii. p. 116.

⁹ Matt. xx. 23.

¹ Joannes Campini published an explication of an ancient marble monument, which he thinks to have been of the sixth century. It represents, in *basso relievo*, a huge caldron or vessel, in which are a king and a queen; and a man, standing by it, pours water upon the head of the king, who is praying with his hands joined. This he supposes to describe the baptism of some prince, performed by *immersion* or *superinfusion*. See *Act. Erudit.* 1698, p. 46.

² *De Anima*, p. 311. ³ Tertul. c. Marc. iii. 24. *Constat Ethnicis quoque testibus.*

⁴ An account of Tertullian and his writings will be found in its proper place.—EDIT.

Testament; and, if they are not genuine, are an infamous imposture, for which the forger well deserved the punishment inflicted by the Roman laws on the *Falsarii*.⁵ The authors of them are, it is pretended, the twelve apostles and St. Paul gathered together, with Clemens their *amanuensis*.

If their authority should appear only ambiguous, it would be our duty to reject them, lest we should adopt as divine doctrines *the commandments of men*: for since each Gospel contains the main parts of Christianity, and might be sufficient *to make men wise unto salvation*, there is less danger in diminishing than in enlarging the number of canonical books; and less evil would have ensued from the loss of one of the four Gospels, than from the addition of a fifth and spurious one. But the *Constitutions* are a medley of old treatises jumbled together, enlarged, and adulterated, without much wit or judgment, by some compiler after the days of Constantine. And yet they have their value, and may be useful on many accounts, and contain several things of antiquity relating to the doctrine and discipline of the church, and extracts from old Liturgies; though the whole be so blended with insertions of a later date, that it is now beyond human skill to make the separation with any certainty.⁶ I offered some

⁵ *Digest*. L. xlviii. *Tit.* x. 1.

⁶ The *Apostolical Constitutions*, as they are called, are comprised in *eight* books, setting forth the origin and constitution of the church, the offices and duties of its ministers, rules and regulations for the celebration of divine service, together with a complete Liturgy, or form of public worship, and a severe and rigid code of Christian morality. It should seem that the exaltation of the episcopal dignity was the immediate object of their compilation; and the injunctions prescribed with that view are alone sufficient to disprove their apostolic origin, independently of those other marks of forgery, which Dr. Jortin and others have pointed out. From the fact that Epiphanius, the first author who mentions them by the above title, quotes a passage which is directly at variance with the existing context, they have doubtless been corrupted even since his time; and though he speaks of them as containing much edifying matter, he is so far from claiming for it the sanction of the apostles, that he expressly states a prevailing doubt of their genuineness. Though Jortin refers them to some period after Constantine, and it may be that they did not attain their present form until the fifth century, it is the general opinion of critics that they bear internal marks of a date prior to the Council of Nice. They are quoted or referred to by Epiphanius, Eusebius, and Athanasius; and the greater part of them were, in all probability, compiled during the second and third centuries. They are accordingly valuable, not only for the excellence of many of the precepts, and the simple piety by which many of the prayers are characterised, but for the insight afforded into the existing condition of the early church. Their merits,

remarks upon them in *Disc. vi. on the Christian Religion*: and I shall here add a few more.

They have a chapter *περὶ χαρισμάτων*, in which they observe that the word *χάρισμα* means either the gift of working miracles, or the gift of spiritual and Christian graces; that the first is conferred on some, the second on all true Christians; and that miraculous powers are not so much for the use of Christians, as for the sake and for the conviction of unbelievers.⁷ Baptism also and the Lord's Supper are sometimes called *Χαρίσματα*.⁸ In the form for the ordination of Presbyters, they pray that the Presbyter may have the *gift of healing* conferred upon him, *ὅπως πλησθεὶς ἐνεργημάτων λαϊκῶν καὶ λόγου διδακτικοῦ, ἐν πραότητι παιδεύῃ σου τὸν λαόν*.⁹

They introduce the apostles, one or all, sometimes speaking and commanding in their own names, and sometimes citing the New Testament as we now cite it. This single observation is sufficient to upset the book. Jesus Christ, say they, began to *do* before he began to *teach*, *ὡς ποῦ λέγει ὁ Λουκᾶς· Ὡν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν*. *This is wanting in one of the MSS.*, says Le Clerc, *and seems to have been struck out by some critic, who thought it wrong to introduce the apostles citing the testimony of Luke*. But it signified nothing to strike out one passage, whilst five hundred of the same kind were left. Besides, it was all in vain: because, though the citation here were taken away, the allusion to it would remain.¹

They repeat it over and over, lest Christians should chance to forget it, that a bishop is a god, a god upon earth, and a king, and infinitely superior to a king, and ruling over rulers and kings. They command Christians to give him tribute as to a king, and to reverence him as a god, and to pay him tithes and first-fruits, *according*, say they, *to God's command*; and they

however, must be estimated apart from the object for which the forgery was executed; and the more so, as it is remarkable for the asceticism of its devotion, its ridiculous perversions of Scripture, and the fact, that, after all, it asserts an authority to which it has no claim.—EDIT. 7 viii. 1.

⁸ Ignatius saw Polycarp at Smyrna, *καὶ πνευματικῶν αὐτῷ ἐκοινώνησε χαρισμάτων*. (Martyr. Ignat. § iii.) *Πνευματικὰ χαρίσματα videntur hic significare symbola eucharistica. Certe baptismum non raro apud veteres vocatur χάρισμα. Clericus.* [See Clem. Alex. Pæd. I. 113, 27.—EDIT.]

⁹ viii. 16. Taken, I suppose, from 1 Cor. xii. 9, *ἀλλὰ δὲ χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων*. 1 ii. 6.

strictly forbid Christians to make any inquiry, and to take any notice, whether he disposes of these revenues well or ill²: which seems to have been drawn up at a time when there were Christian emperors. Here is strange language indeed! Even far beyond all *eminencies* and *holinesses*.

Le Clerc had a suspicion that *Leontius*, an Arian bishop of the fourth century, was the inventor, or the interpolator, of the Constitutions. Le Clerc received the hint from *Thomas Bruno*, who was a learned and ingenious man, and a canon of Windsor in the days of Charles II. The learned *Isaac Vossius*, who also was canon of Windsor, dedicated to him his book *de Sibyllinis Oraculis*. Bruno conjectured that *Leontius* might be the collector of the greater part of the *Apostolical Canons*, and says many things in favour of *Leontius*. Speaking of the religious controversies in the time of Constantius, which were not very edifying, he says; *Et certe præter unum Athanasium inter orthodoxos, et Leontium inter Arianos, vix ullos reperias homines quadratos, dictis, factis, formulis suis Fidei stantes; sed potius versipelles, chamæleontes, nunc in hanc, nunc in illam partem paratos, prout ferebat animus τῶν παραδυναστευόντων apud Imperatorem; qui vel eunuchos Imperatorios opibus ecclesiæ et nummis, vel mulierculas ἐν γυναικωνίτιδι sermonum lenociniis et blanditiis pelliciebant in partes suas, omniaque pro libitu suo agebant, ferebant, cæteris majore ex parte, more pecudum, non qua eundum erat, sed qua ibatur, prospicientibus.*³

It is certain that *Leontius* carried his head high enough. He reprimanded the Emperor Constantius for meddling in ecclesiastical affairs; and sent word to the Empress Eusebia, who is said to have been haughty, that he would not comply with her request, and pay her a visit, unless she would promise to bow down before him and receive his blessing, and then to stand up, whilst he sat, till he should give her leave to sit down: which put the lady into a violent rage.⁴ I know not whether *Leontius* learned from the Jews to take this state upon him. Their Rabbins say that the high-priest never went to court, but when

² ii. 11, 26, 35, *et passim*.

³ Judic. de Canon. in the second volume of the *Patres Apostolici*.

⁴ See Tillemont *Hist. des Emp.* iii. 381; or Le Clerc *Dissert. de Constit.* in the *Patr. Apost.*

he had a mind; and that then he sat before the king, and the king stood up in his presence.⁵

It is, I believe, labour lost to inquire who the compiler was. We can only say of this pretended Clemens, that he was long-lived; and if any one should ever compile a book *de Macrobiis*, or *de Incredibilibus*, like those of *Phlegon* and *Palæphatus*, he ought to take notice of our author: for he flourished in the first, second, third, and fourth centuries. It is no wonder therefore if his memory failed him sometimes, and if he fell into some small mistakes. But there have been two men, since the Christian era, who in length of days greatly surpassed him:—*Josephus Ben Gorion*, who, according to his own chronology, lived to be a thousand years old; and the *Wandering Jew*, who was seen by an Armenian bishop five hundred years ago, and is supposed to be still alive, and pursuing his travels.⁶

The Constitutions confirm many frivolous precepts by texts of Scripture, which in these critical days would be thought inconclusive. For example: A *vintner's* money must not be accepted by the bishop.⁷ Why? Because Isaiah, according to the LXX, says, *Thy vintners mix wine with water.*⁸ But it would be endless to produce their misinterpreted and misapplied citations of Scripture, both canonical and apocryphal.

The antiquity of *Solomon's Song* is sufficiently established by the Hebrew original, and by the version of the LXX: and it is mentioned in the 76th Apostolical Canon. It has been observed that it is never cited in the New Testament.⁹ It is mentioned as a book of the Old Testament by Melito,¹ and Hippolytus and Origen wrote commentaries upon it. Whether any Christian before them has cited it, I know not. A writer, whom I need not mention, is for uncanonising it: but there is nothing new under the sun. Theodorus Mopsuestenus was of the same mind, who lived in the fourth and fifth centuries; and was a learned bishop, a bold critic, and an enemy to allegorical interpretations.

⁵ See Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, I. 4.

⁶ This, again, is one of those passages which have gained for our author the appellation of the “flippant Jortin.” Leaving the reader to note those of similar caste, we may remark, by the way, that they will generally be found quite as *shrewd* as *flippant*.—EDIT.

⁷ iv. 6.

⁸ Isai. i. 22.

⁹ Vitringa (*ad Apocalyps.* iii. p. 158) is of opinion that there are *allusions* to it in the New Testament.

¹ In Euseb. E. H. iv. 26.

Leontius of Jerusalem finds great fault with him, and says,—*Imo et sanctorum sanctissimum Canticum canticorum ab omnibus divinarum rerum peritis et ab omnibus Ecclesiis cuncti orbis notum, et a Judæis inimicis crucis Christi in admiratione habitum, libidinose pro sua et mente et lingua meretricia interpretans, sua supra modum incredibili audacia ex libris sacris abscidit.* It seems, Theodorus took the *Spouse* in that book to be one of Solomon's queens.²

This Theodorus, and Origen, are looked upon as the fathers of a doctrine, which in the fifth century was called Pelagianism, or Semi-Pelagianism. Cardinal Noris charges them with it in his *Historia Pelagiana*, and I verily believe that he does them no great wrong; and that they had notions entirely different from those of Augustin, and of Jansenius, about predestination; and that the arguments of the bishop of Hippo, or of the Bishop of Ypres, would have converted neither the one nor the other. The Anti-Jansenists of the Church of Rome condemn the predestinarian doctrines of Luther, and Calvin, and Jansenius; but excuse Augustin, and pretend to agree with this Latin Father, whilst they plainly reject his notions. They are not so ingenious as the monk, who, being pressed with an argument taken from St. Paul, replied, that *St. Paul might as well have refrained from saying some things which smelt of the faggot.*

Chardin tells us that the sublimest and best esteemed poetry among the Persians, is that which sets out religious subjects in the phrase of libertines. Whether this be applicable to Solomon's Song, I will not take upon me to determine. There are also many passages in the Old, and some in the New Testament, where things spiritual are couched under phrases, which the reserved modesty of modern language will hardly permit us to illustrate.

The Constitutions, however, twice allude to Solomon's Song, and they seem to have borrowed the allusions from the larger Epistles of Ignatius. *Heretics*, say they, are ἀλωπέκων μερίδες καὶ χαμαιζήλων ἀμπελώνων ἀφανισταί.³ And again: τὴν ἐκκλησίαν Θεοῦ διαφθείροντες, ὡς ἀλώπεκες μικροὶ ἀμπελῶνα.⁴ Ignatius⁵:—ἔστιν ἀλώπηξ, φθορεὺς ἀμπελῶνος Χριστοῦ. Cantic. ii. 15. Πιάσατε ἡμῖν ἀλώπεκας μικροὺς ἀφανίζοντας ἀμπελῶνας, *Take us*

² See Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* ix. 159.

³ vi. 13.

⁴ vi. 18.

⁵ *Epist. Interpol. ad Philad.* c. 3.

the little foxes that spoil the vines. So, according to the Constitutions and the *interpolated* Ignatius, the *heretics* are *the little foxes who spoil the vineyards.* I blame not the allusion; it is pretty enough, and better than the remark of a commentator whom I will not name, who, explaining 1 Kings x. 22. *Once in three years came the navy of Tharshish, bringing gold and silver, ivory, apes, and peacocks,* says that by the *apes* we are to understand *heretics.* He bears somewhat hard upon the poor ape, who is an occasional conformist, and an imitator of his betters. What will they say to this allusion, who reject Solomon's Song, and yet receive the Constitutions and the larger Epistles of Ignatius?

But it would not be fair to conceal a passage in Theocritus,⁷

Ἀμφὶ δέ μιν δὺ ἁλώπεκες· ἃ μὲν ἀν' ὄρχως
Φοιτῇ σινομένα τὰν τρώξιμον.

And⁸

Μισέω τὰς δασυκέρκους ἁλώπεκας, αἱ τὰ Μίκωνος
Αἰεὶ φοιτῶσαι τὰ ποθέσπερα βραγίζοντι.

for here also are *foxes spoiling the vineyards*; and who knows but somebody may take it into his head to say that the Constitutions and Ignatius borrowed the hint from the poet? This *interpolated* Ignatius cites the Canticles as a sacred book⁹:—*Μῦρον γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐκκενωθὲν ὄνομά σου· διὰ τοῦτο νεάνιδες ἠγάπησάν σε, εἴλκυσάν σε, ὀπίσω εἰς ὁσμὴν μύρων σου δραμούμεθα.*¹

It seems to appear from the Constitutions, that the curing of Demoniacs was a work of time, and that the attempt did not always succeed: for the congregation is made to consist of the clergy, the catechumens, the *energumens* or demoniacs, the *φωτιζόμενοι* or those who were preparing to receive baptism, the penitents, and the faithful; there is a form of prayer for the energumens, that God would deliver them;² and it is said that a demoniac may be instructed in the faith, but shall not be received to Christian communion before he be cleansed, unless he be in danger of dying.³ In a prayer for all mankind, there

⁶ He might as well have said, since he would allegorise, that the *apes* are *informers* and *backbiters*; for the bite of an ape is reckoned dangerous, and so is the bite of a sycophant. Δῆγμα συκοφάντου is mentioned as incurable by Aristophanes (*Plut.* 886).

⁷ Idyl. i. 48.

⁸ Id. v. 112.

⁹ *Ad Ephes.* c. 17.

¹ From *Cant.* i. 3, 4.

² viii. 7.

³ viii. 32.

is a petition for the demoniacs :—ὕπὲρ τῶν χειμαζομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου, ὅπως καθαρίσῃς ἐκ τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ πονηροῦ.⁴

Is it not probable that the ancient Christians accounted mad, and melancholy, and epileptic people to be possessed, at least for the most part? This would greatly increase the number of Demoniacs. The Jews seem to have received some additional notions concerning evil spirits and their operations from the Chaldæans, and, after their return from the captivity, to have ascribed many diseases and disorders to these invisible agents, besides those which were not to be accounted for by natural causes; and in this the ancient Christians followed them. Light-foot says, *Judæis usitatissimum erat morbos quosdam graviores, eos præsertim quibus distortum erat corpus, vel mens turbata et agitata phrenesi, malis spiritibus attribuere.*⁵ Hence those swarms of energumens and exorcists mentioned in ecclesiastical history.

The Constitutions perhaps command, but most certainly permit, Infant-baptism. Βαπτίζετε δὲ ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια, καὶ ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ Θεοῦ, *but baptize even (or also) your infants, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of God;* which shows that infant-baptism was practised when this book was written. There is no eluding this testimony; it signifies nothing to say that νήπιον is a word which may be extended beyond infancy, to thirteen or fifteen years: for first, Christian education and instruction is mentioned as subsequent to baptism; secondly, in general precepts the obvious and usual signification of the words is to be supposed the intention of the lawgiver; thirdly, it is plain to the last degree that the word νήπιος, or νήπιον, will not exclude infants of a day old, *ut contra si quis sentiat, nihil sentiat*; fourthly, the sentence is partly borrowed from *Ephes. vi. 4.* μὴ παροργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ Κυρίου, but instead of τέκνα, νήπια is used, as denoting a more tender age. In the prayer for the faithful, a petition is offered up for Christian infants :—τῶν νηπίων τῆς ἐκκλησίας μνημονεύσωμεν, ὅπως ὁ Κύριος, τελειώσας αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ φόβῳ αὐτοῦ, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας ἀγάγῃ.⁶ Again, τὰ νήπια

⁴ viii. 12. In Apost. Can. 70 : ἐάν τις δαίμονα ἔχῃ, κληρικὸς μὴ γινέσθω, ἀλλὰ μὴδὲ τοῖς πιστοῖς συνευχέσθω· καθαρισθεὶς δὲ προσδεχέσθω, καὶ, ἐάν ᾖ ἅγιος, γινέσθω.

⁵ Hor. Hebr.

⁶ viii. 10.

ἄδρυνον.⁸ Will any man be so unreasonable as to contend that *νήπια* here does not include *babes*; and that infants, before they could walk and speak, were excluded from the benefit and intention of these prayers?

Thus infant-baptism may be proved by the Constitutions; but at the same time the silence of the Scriptures upon this subject, compared with the clear declarations of the Constitutions, shows that these were drawn up after the Apostolical age.⁹ It is observable, however, that¹ where directions are given who shall be admitted to baptism, no mention is made of infants.

The Constitutions make the validity of baptism to depend upon a certain form of invocation, and they seem to make it depend also upon the piety of the priest; which is a hard case. In the ceremonial of baptism, when the person is anointed, there is a form of prayer to be used; for, say they, ἐὰν μὴ εἰς ἕκαστον τούτων ἐπὶ κλήσις γένηται παρὰ τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς ἱερέως τοιαύτη τις, εἰς ὕδωρ μόνον καταβαίνει ὁ βαπτιζόμενος, ὡς Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ ἀποτίθεται μόνον τὸν ῥύπον τοῦ σώματος, οὐ τὸν ῥύπον τῆς ψυχῆς. Where Cotelerius says; *Loquitur de baptismo ordinario adultorum, quod nisi sedulo ac rite juxta totam cærimoniam tradatur a pio sacerdote, et suscipiatur a pio catechumeno, animæ sordes non depellit, nec suum obtinet effectum.*

In the middle of the third century, great disputes arose concerning *rebaptising* those, who had been baptised by heretics. The Constitutions and Canons determine that the baptism administered by heretics is invalid and null;² which was the doctrine of Cyprian. In this controversy, no appeal was made to the Constitutions.³

The Constitutions represent *adultery* as a crime which was punished with death:—εἴ τις ἀδελφὸν λέγων ἑαυτὸν εἶναι, ἀπατηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ κακαποιήσῃ, καὶ ἐλεγχθεὶς κατακριθῇ θανάτῳ ὡς μοιχὸς, ἢ φονεὺς, χωρίζεσθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.⁴ Constantine made a law to punish adultery with death; and before his time it had not been a capital crime, in that sense, in the Roman Empire. The *Lex Julia de Adulteriis coercendis* is discussed in the *Digests*;⁵ but we are not clearly informed there what was the punishment. It seems to have been *relegatio*, a kind of banishment.⁶ In some

⁸ viii. 15. ⁹ vi. 15. ¹ viii. 32. ² vi. 15. ³ vii. 44. ⁴ v. 2. ⁵ L. xlviii. Tit. 5.

⁶ See Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 50, and the notes of *Vertranius* and *Lipsius*; *Ann.* iv. 42,

cases, however, the father and the husband had a right to kill the guilty person, surprised in the crime. I mention not this as an unanswerable objection to the Constitutions, since death might have been the punishment of adultery in some places long before the law of Constantine, and since the adulterous Christian might be no Roman citizen.

The best parts of the Constitutions are some of the prayers, taken probably from old Liturgies.

The *Hellenistic* language, as it is called, has been mentioned as a confirmation of the Constitutions. Now this Hellenistic style is nothing more than the style of one who translates a Hebrew book verbally into Greek, or who thinks in Hebrew and writes in Greek. Suppose any person at any time, whose native language is Greek, who is a Christian, who reads few or no profane authors, who never studied his own tongue, who has frequently perused the Septuagint and the New Testament, and has them almost by heart, who writes upon a religious subject, who is perpetually citing the Scriptures: this person will write in the Hellenistic manner, more or less, and will have Hebrew idioms, even though he should not understand one word of the language; especially if he has a mind to affect that style, which is very easily imitated.

My friend Mr. Wasse, if I remember right, used to say that the style of the Constitutions was Hellenistic. Be this as it will, there are in them abundance of words and phrases never used by the writers of the New Testament, though they afterwards appear in Ecclesiastical authors; and some which are not at all in the old Christian style: as, for example, ὁ θεῖος Μωσῆς, which seems polite and Pagan, rather than apostolical.⁷ The scribbler, who is called *Dionysius the Areopagite*, has the same expression:—γράφει δὲ καὶ ὁ θεῖος Ἰγνάτιος.⁸ And so the *Clementine Epitome*:—ὁ θεῖος Κλήμης.⁹ Ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος, says Clemens Alex. speaking of St. Paul;¹ but he is a learned writer, and borrows a thousand phrases from Pagans.²

and the *Excursus* of *Lipsius*, and *Novell.* cxxxiv. 10, and a Treatise of *Gerard Noodt*, called *Diocletianus et Maximianus, sive de transactione et pactione criminum.*

⁷ vi. 25.

⁸ *De Div. Nomin.*

⁹ § 157.

¹ I. p. 287, 602.

² Of the *Common* or *Hellenic* dialect of the later Greek writers, see "*A Greek Grammar to the New Testament*" (§ 2), by the EDITOR.

The Constitutions say that the Jews crucified malefactors;³ which is not true.⁴ They say that Herod ordered Christ to be crucified; which is a mistake.⁵ They say that Moses forbade the Jews to read the Law out of the borders of their own country; which prohibition is not to be found.⁶ They order widows to stay at home, to be grave, &c., and then they censure those who ramble about, and are busy bodies, and idle talkers; and call them *μὴ χήρας ἀλλὰ πῆρας*, *not widows but beggars' wallets*, *ἐτοίμους εἰς τὸ λαμβάνειν*, *ever ready to receive*.⁷ But the beauty of the original is lost in the translation, because the words are nearly alike in sound, and different in sense: so that the jingle cannot be preserved. It is as if we should say in English, such widows behave themselves not *godly* but *odly*. They say that a rich covetous man is like a dragon guarding a treasure;⁸ which emblem is borrowed from those profane authors, whom they forbid Christians to read.

Vulpis cubile fodiens, dum terram eruit,—
Pervenit ad draconis speluncam ultimam,
Custodiebat qui thesauros abditos.⁹

Largiris nihil, incubasque gazæ,
Ut magnus draco, quem canunt poëtæ
Custodem Sythici fuisse luci.¹

They teach the resurrection of the same *numerical* body—a doctrine concerning which the Scriptures are certainly silent.² Those are *heretics*, say they, who make the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to be one and the same person, and Jesus to be τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεόν.³ This is supposed to be levelled against *Simon Magus*; but it is much more probable that it is against the *Sabellians*. Having ordered Christians to honour the martyrs, they caution them not to honour false martyrs.⁴ If, by *ψευδομάρτυρες*, they only meant persons who perjured themselves and bare false witness, as their citations may seem to imply, the caution was extremely ridiculous: but it is more probable that they meant either schismatics, or unfortunate

³ ii. 48.

⁴ See Le Clerc's Hammond on John xviii. 31, and Grotius on Galat. iii. 13.

⁵ v. 19.

⁶ vi. 25.

⁷ iii. 6.

⁸ iv. 4.

⁹ Phædrus, iv. 19.

¹ Martial, Epigr. xii. 53.

² v. 7.

³ vi. 26.

⁴ v. 9.

men, mistaken in some points of faith, whom they would not allow to be martyrs, though they died for the name of Christ, and though they might have lived, if they would have renounced him: such, for example, as the *Novatians*. They make St. John say, *I got up, ἀναστὰς ἐγὼ, and leaning upon Christ's breast I asked him, &c.*⁵ As they reclined on couches before the table, St. John was seated the next below his Master, so that the back of his head was against the breast of Christ. He had therefore no occasion to get up; but only to raise himself, and turn his head a little, when he spake to Christ. They make St. John affirm that σὺ εἶπας, *thou hast said*, is not the same as *yes*.⁶ They take much from the *Epistle of Barnabas*,—for it is improbable that Barnabas should plunder them; and never own or hint the obligation. Now Barnabas wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem. They say at the end of a prayer—*Gather us into thy Kingdom, Αὕτη μαρναθά, i. e. Hæc venit Dominus*, which is little to the purpose. In the same prayer they say, ὁ δυνατὸς Θεὸς, ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινὸς, καὶ ἀψευδὴς ἐν ταῖς ἐπαγγελίαις, which looks as if it were taken from Polycarp's prayer, ὁ ἀψευδὴς καὶ ἀληθινὸς Θεός.⁷ The Invocation after the Communion begins thus, Δέσποτα ὁ Θεὸς, ὁ καὶ τῶν σιωπώντων ἐπιστάμενος τὰς ἐντεύξεις.⁸ The expression is elegant and noble, but it seems to be taken from an old *Delphic Oracle*, in Herodotus,⁹ Καὶ κωφοῦ συνλήμι, καὶ οὐ φωνεῦντος ἀκούω. They insert in a prayer, *The holy Angels say to thee, εἰς ἅγιος τῷ Φελμωνί.*¹ It is taken from *Daniel* viii. 13, Καὶ ἤκουσα ἐνὸς ἁγίου λαλοῦντος, καὶ εἶπεν, εἰς ἅγιος τῷ Φελμωνί τῷ λαλοῦντι· ἕως πότε κ. τ. λ. As it is introduced in the Constitutions, it is neither better nor worse than gibberish; and he who put it in, did not understand it. They say that the *golden calf* was the Egyptian *Apis*,² and so says the author of the *Recognitions*;³ which, if true, was yet more than they could certainly know, unless we should grant them to have had it by inspiration.⁴ They relate Peter's combat with Simon, in which he shot the magician flying, and brought him down to the ground.⁵ The false

⁵ v. 14.⁶ v. 14.⁷ vii. 26. Consult the notes in the *Patr. Apost.*⁸ viii. 15.⁹ Herod. i. 47.¹ vii. 35.² i. 6; vi. 20.³ i. 35.⁴ Surely it needed no inspiration to discover this. Of the fact there can be no doubt.—EDIT.

Hegesippus, and one *Abdias* in his *Historia Apostolica*, confirm it likewise. So we have no less than three witnesses for it; but they are *Sardi venales, alius alio nequior*. The first author, fit to be named, who speaks of it, is *Arnobius*; and he comes too late. *Cotelerius*, in his notes on the Constitutions, very honestly declares himself to be a doubter, and gives the reader leave to reject the story; but *Tillemont* is not so indulgent, and comes upon us with a formidable list of vouchers:—*Quand il seroit vray que cette histoire seroit une fiction, nous aimerions mieux, tant qu'on n'aura point de preuve claire et convaincante de sa fausseté, nous tromper en ce point avec Arnobe, S. Cyrille de Jérusalem, les légats du Pape Libère, S. Ambroise, S. Augustin, S. Isidore de Peluse, S. Théodoret, et plusieurs autres, que d'estre obligés d'accuser d'une crédulité indiscrete un grand nombre des plus illustres maîtres de l'Eglise Latine et Grecque.*⁶ He who will believe all that he finds related by the writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, should be provided with a double portion of credulity, and have the stomach of an ostrich to digest fables. But the fathers here mentioned were not the inventors of this *combat*: they stand clear of such a charge, and are only to be blamed for paying too much regard to traditionary reports, or to some fabulous author.⁷ One would think that the silence of the fathers before *Arnobius* were alone a sufficient reason to reject the story, and particularly the silence of *Eusebius*, who wrote after *Arnobius*; and their silence shows at the same time that they knew nothing, or believed nothing, of the Constitutions.

Let it be observed, to the honour of *Eusebius*,⁸ that of all the ancient ecclesiastical historians, he has obtruded the least trash upon his readers; and that he has also shut out from the Scriptures of the New Testament all spurious, dubious, and apocryphal authors, all apostles falsely so called, whom he served as Jupiter did *Vulcan*:—*Πίψε, ποδὸς τεταγών, ἀπὸ βηλοῦ θεσπεσίω.*⁹

The Constitutions call the name of Christ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ

⁶ *Tillemont*, Hist. Eccl. i. p. 178.

⁷ *Leucius* was in all probability the inventor of this lie, as *Beausobre* conjectures (Hist. de Man. i. 396).

⁸ *Eusebius* and his writings are the subject of our author's *Remarks*, in their proper place.—EDIT.

⁹ *Hurl'd headlong tumbling from th' ethereal sky.*

καινόν—(from Isaiah lxii. 2); which yet looks also like an allusion to Revel. ii. 17. ὄνομα καινόν. iii. 12. τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ καινόν. They say that the church of Christ is νύμφη κεκαλλωπισμένη Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ, perhaps from Revel. xxi. 2. ἡτοιμασμένην ὡς νύμφην κεκοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς.¹ And yet the seventy-sixth *Apostolical Canon* mentions not the Revelation amongst the books of the New Testament. The same canon ascribes to St. Paul the Epistle to the Hebrews. They say that the *tithes* are due to the clergy, because Ἰῶτα, which stands for *ten*, is the first letter of the name of Jesus.² Many of the clergy would be in a poor condition, if they had no better claim to them. They give an interpretation of the proper name *Israel*; concerning which see the notes.³ They abound with citations of the Scriptures, and are remarkable for an exuberant profusion of words, and a most tiresome repetition of the same things; which shows that in all probability they are not one man's invention, but a medley. They not only heap passages of Scripture one upon another, but where the thing might have been alluded to in three words, they transcribe whole pages: *aliter non fit liber*.—After having censured all the other Jewish sects, they give the Essenes a good character;—οἱ δὲ τούτων πάντων ἑαυτοὺς χωρίσαντες, καὶ τὰ πατρια φυλάσσοντες, εἰσὶν Ἑσσαῖοι.⁴

When the Jews were returned from Babylon, and before the coming of Christ, three sects arose amongst them, the *Sadducees*, the *Pharisees*, and the *Essenes*;⁵ of which, though none were good, the Sadducees were the worst, the Pharisees the best, and the Essenes superstitious fanatics.

The *Sadducees* were of opinion that they neither wanted nor received any divine assistance for the performance of their duty; that the rewards and the punishments which God had denounced, were only temporal; that there were neither angels, nor spirits, nor resurrection, nor future state, but that the whole man perished at death. It has been supposed, but not sufficiently proved, that they rejected not only the *traditions* of the elders,

¹ ii. 15, 25.

² ii. 25.

³ vii. 36. [The notes referred to are those in the *Patres Apostoloci* of Cotelierius.—EDIT.]

⁴ vi. 6.

⁵ For full information respecting the *Jewish* sects, see Horne's *Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures*, vol. iii.; and Jahn's *Biblical Archaeology*, P. iii. c. 1. §§ 316—323.—EDIT.

but the writings of the prophets, and all the sacred books, except the Law. So thought Jerome, and many of the fathers.

Our Saviour proved a future state to the Sadducees from a text in the books of Moses, where God is called the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, after they were dead.⁶ Hence it has been inferred, that the Sadducees rejected the Prophets; else, say they, Christ would have appealed to the prophets, who teach this doctrine more fully. But why so? From the words of Moses cited by our Saviour the doctrine of a future state may as clearly be deduced, as from any one single text which can be produced out of any one of the prophets. The Sadducees might pay a greater regard to Moses than to the other prophets, and yet not reject them neither. Besides, as the Sadducees, in their discourse with Christ, raised an objection to another state from a passage in Moses,⁷ Christ chose to answer them from the same author.⁸

[I have joined myself with those, who think that the Sadducees did not reject the prophets; or at least, that we cannot prove them to have been guilty of this fault. But I am thrown into a state of doubting by an opinion inclining to the contrary side, and maintained by one of whose skill and judgment I think better than of my own; and would therefore beg to produce some further reasons for my sentiment.⁹

The question, he thinks, is determined by Josephus; and I am very willing to appeal to him. Let us hear what he says to it:—Νόμιμα πολλά τινα παρέδοσαν τῷ δήμῳ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς, ἅπερ οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς Μωϋσέως νόμοις· καὶ διὰ

⁶ Exod. iii. 6, 15; Matt. xxii. 32.

⁷ Deut. xxv. 5; Matt. xxxi. 24.

⁸ *Hoc fundamento usi sunt Sadducei, nullum articulum fidei admittendum esse, qui non ex libris Mosaicis probari posset. Reliquos autem Scripturæ libros ipsi legébant, et ita interpretabantur, ut fundamento suo contradicere non viderentur.*—Pearson, *Vindic. Ignat.* c. vii. Basnage is of the same opinion (*Hist. des Juifs*, ii. 6.). *Tota religio consistit in libris Mosis: in cæteris nullum fidei seu legis dogma statuitur*, says Orobius, who yet was no Sadducee, but rather, like most of his brethren, a follower of the Pharisees.

⁹ These additional remarks, enclosed within brackets, were originally published as an appendix to the second volume of the first edition, by way of reply to a correspondent, whose name, though known to the author, was not divulged. They are here divested of the epistolary form, as unsuited to their introduction into the body of the work. The student will find some valuable observations on the same subject in Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, note 56.—EDIT.

τοῦτο ταῦτα τὸ Σαδδουκαίων γένος ἐκβάλλει, λέγον ἐκεῖνα δεῖν ἡγεῖσθαι νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα, τὰ δ' ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων μὴ τηρεῖν· καὶ περὶ τούτων ζητήσεις αὐτοῖς καὶ διαφορὰς γενέσθαι συνέβαινε μεγάλας.¹ Again :—Σαδδουκαίοις δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς ὁ λόγος συναφανίζει τοῖς σώμασι, φυλακῆς δὲ οὐδαμῶν τινῶν μεταποίησις αὐτοῖς ἢ τῶν νόμων· πρὸς γὰρ τοὺς διδασκάλους σοφίας, ἣν μετρίασιν, ἀμφιλογεῖν ἀρετὴν ἀριθμοῦσι.²

Σοφία here is Rabbinical, Pharisaical, traditionary *wisdom*, and its professors and doctors were called Σοφοὶ, *Chachams*. *Wisdom* is the doctrine of the Jewish schools and synagogues. So then,

1. The Sadducees, says Josephus, observe the laws, and nothing else. Now νόμος and νόμοι, though strictly they mean *the Law of Moses*, yet sometimes include *the Prophets* in Jewish phrase ; as *John* x. 34. *Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are Gods?* that is, in the Psalms.³ And again, xv. 25. *that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause.* In their law, that is, in the Psalms.⁴ St. Paul, after having cited the Psalms, subjoins, *Now we know that whatsoever things the law saith, etc.*⁵

2. Josephus says, that the Sadducees observed *only* the laws, that is, if you please, the laws of Moses. Be it so ; but this *only* is plainly opposed by him to the *unwritten law*, and therefore the prophets seem to be out of the question. The Pharisees, on the other hand, delivered precepts which were not written in the laws of Moses : and I add, nor in the prophets neither. In the controversy between these two sects, the Sadducees did right in rejecting the oral and traditionary law, and our Saviour decided it on their side ; which also made them the more favourable to him during his ministry.

¹ The Pharisees have delivered to the people many precepts from the tradition of the fathers, which are not written in the Laws of Moses ; and for this reason the Sadducees reject them, saying, that those are only to be accounted statutes and precepts which are written, and that those which are delivered down by tradition are not to be regarded ; and upon this subject they have had perpetual disputations and great contentions (*Ant.* xiii. x. 6).

² The Sadducees hold that the soul and body perish together, and think themselves bound to observe nothing besides the Laws ; but judge it right and commendable to dispute against the teachers of what is called wisdom (*Ant.* xviii. i. 4.).

³ Ps. lxxxii. 6.

⁴ Ps. xxxv. 19 ; lxix. 4.

⁵ Rom. iii. 9.

3. *The Sadducees received no precepts besides those which were contained in the Law; therefore they rejected the prophets.* I deny the consequence, for this reason, that there are in the prophets no νόμοι and νόμιμα, no laws, no statutes, no articles of Jewish faith, no fundamentals, which are not contained, either explicitly or implicitly, in the Law of Moses. The prophets were not, properly speaking, legislators, but enforcers of the Mosaic system.

4. Josephus had no love for the Sadducees, and gives them a bad character, and had no reason to fear them, and was not at all disposed to spare them. If they had rejected the prophets, he would have charged them with it expressly, and not have left us to collect it from oblique hints and dark intimations. *Tantumne rem tam negligenter!* It is inconceivable.

5. The sacred writers of the New Testament, who have spoken of the Sadducees in many places, and have given us an account of their errors, have also omitted the mention of this capital one. Strange indeed! To this must be added the silence of the *Apostolical Constitutions* and the *Recognitions of Clemens*; in which the Sadducees are censured for denying the resurrection of the dead, but not for rejecting the prophets.

6. Josephus, writing against Apion,⁶ mentions the sacred books which were received by his nation, and boasts of the religious and uncommon care with which they had been preserved, and of the universal and uniform respect paid to them by the Jews; by ALL and EVERY Jew, and consequently by Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. If it had not been so, the friends of Apion, and the adversaries of Josephus, and of the poor Jewish nation, would have said to the historian, *Thou art an audacious Romancer, to talk with such confidence and effrontery of this uniform consent, when a whole sect of thy countrymen reject all those books, the Pentateuch excepted.* Here was the proper place for Josephus to mention the Sadducees with ignominy, as despisers of the prophets, and little better than apostates.

⁶ Cont. Ap. i. 8. Δύο δὲ μόνα (εἰσὶ παρ' ἡμῶν) πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσι βίβλια, τὰ δικαίως θεῖα πεπιστευμένα.—δῆλον δ' ἐστὶν ἔργῳ πῶς ἡμεῖς τοῖς ἰδίῳις γράμμασι πεπιστεύκαμεν· τοσούτου γὰρ αἰῶνος ἤδη παρῳηκότος, οὔτε προσθεῖναι τις οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀφελεῖν αὐτῶν, οὔτε μεταθεῖναι τετόλμηκεν. ΠΑΣΙ δὲ σύμφυτόν ἐστιν εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς πρώτης γενέσεως ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΙΣ, τὸ νομίζειν αὐτὰ ΘΕΟΥ ΔΟΓΜΑΤΑ, καὶ τούτοις ἐμμένειν, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, εἰ δέοι, θνήσκειν ἡδέως.

7. The Sadducees lay under no temptation to discard the prophets; for the traditions which they opposed and hated were not grounded on the prophets, but on the oral law, and the decrees of the fathers. If a future state had been so taught by any prophet as to leave them no room for doubts and evasions, they might have been induced to decline his authority; but there is nothing of that kind in the sacred books which they did not think themselves able to shuffle or explain away, without having recourse to the desperate expedient of condemning those books. The truth is, that the Sadducees had as poor disputants as themselves to deal with, and contended with adversaries, who knew not how to urge the proper arguments from reason and revelation, and from historical facts contained in the Scriptures, in favour of the permanency of the soul and a future state.

8. The Sadducees conformed to the Pharisees in many things, says Josephus, for fear of the people. If they had struck any of the sacred books out of the canon, it would not have been endured; for they could not reject the prophets without treating them as *liars* and *impostors*. In this case there can be no *medium*. Whosoever speaks as a prophet in the name of the Lord, must be a sacred messenger, or a vile deceiver. If the Sadducees had dared to treat David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, *etc.* in this manner, the people would have stoned them as blasphemers; at the least, they certainly would not have held communion with them, as they did.

9. They knew that Moses had promised a succession of inspired teachers, and had left Joshua for his prophetic successor.

10. They, like the rest of the Jews, had no right to their own lands but by prophetic appointment; and if they rejected the book of Joshua, they rejected the charter by which they held them. They had no claim to the priesthood (and yet some of them were priests) but by their genealogies, which stood partly upon prophetic authority.

11. It has been the temper of all people; it was more particularly the temper of the Jews; to honour and reverence their ancestors. One cannot suppose, unless there were overbearing evidence for it, that the Sadducees accounted their whole history, and all their own annals, from their entrance into Canaan,

to have been a bundle of fictions; and their forefathers, from Joshua to Malachi, to have been made up of two sorts of men, of deceivers who pretended to prophecy, and of dupes who were deluded by them. The very Pagans believed more than this, and paid more regard than this to the Jewish prophets, of whom some had been consulted, protected, and honoured by neighbouring princes.

12. The Sadducees, it may be said, admitted what was *historic*, and discarded what was *didactic* in the sacred books; but see what follows: The Sadducees believed a God, and admitted his government, and a general providence rewarding and punishing the Jewish nation, according as the people observed or neglected the Law of Moses. Now add to this, that they rejected the prophets, and from such a system it must have followed, that God suffered the nation to flourish most under David and Solomon, who both pretended to be prophets; that Ahab, Jezabel, and other wicked princes, did well in cutting off the prophets, and yet were cut off themselves for it; that Moses gave them a most useless instruction, how to distinguish true from false prophets, instead of admonishing them to receive none; that the prophets foretold the fates of their own country, and of neighbouring nations; that their predictions were accomplished; and that, notwithstanding all this, they were false teachers, *etc.* And yet we read of no *Bedlam* erected at Jerusalem for the reception of *these* Sadducees.

13. Some of the Jewish fasts and feasts and religious customs stood upon prophetic authority, and with these the Sadducees complied. They paid as much regard to the temple, and to the service of the temple, as the other Jews, for which they had only prophetic warrant; and they heard the prophets read in the Synagogues.

14. They came at first to John the Baptist, as to a prophet; though perhaps afterwards, like the Pharisees, finding that John was not such an one as they expected, and that he had borne testimony to Christ, they slighted and rejected him.⁷

15. The Rabbins, in their disputes with the Sadducees, have never charged them with discarding the prophets; but on the

⁷ See Matt. iii. 7; Luke vii. 30; and the Commentators.

contrary, reason against them from the prophets. Of this many instances might be given from their writings. *Interrogarunt Sadducei R. Gamalielem, undenam probaret Deum mortuos vivificaturum. Dixit illis, Ex Lege, ex Prophetis, ex Hagiographis: ex Lege, Deuter. xxxi. 16; ex Prophetis, Isai. xxvi. 19; ex Hagiographis, Cant. vii. 9.*⁸

Here are the texts produced by this doctor for proofs of a resurrection. Deut. xxxi. 16. *And the Lord said unto Moses, Behold thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, etc.* Isai. xxvi. 19. *Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise: awake and sing ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.* Cantic. vii. 9. *And the roof of thy mouth like the best wine, for my beloved, that goeth down sweetly, causing the lips of those that are asleep to speak.*⁹ The doctor seems to have been in great distress for a proof *ex Hagiographis*. Surely he might have made a better choice.

In the question before us, the learned are divided:—on one side are *Origen, Tertullian, Jerome, Petavius, Prideaux, etc.*; on the other, *Jos. Scaliger, Pearson, Van Dale, Le Clerc, Samuel and James Basnage, etc.* The case I take to have been this: The Sadducees admitted the prophets, as sent from God to instruct and reform the nation, and to enforce the law; but they held that all articles of faith and fundamentals of religion were contained in the law, and were to be sought nowhere else. So that in reality they paid more regard to the prophets than did the Pharisees, who equalled their silly traditions to the sacred books. In preferring Moses to the prophets, the Jews seem to have been all pretty well agreed, and they made his superiority to consist in several things.

I am not willing to give up the point without a struggle. I have been pleading my cause, partly lest I should seem to take up opinions at mere hazard, and lay them down as easily; and

⁸ Gemara Sanhedrin, cap. 2.

⁹ *Rabbi Schabtai* published, in the year 1683, a catalogue of Rabbinical Writers, and called it *Labia Dormientium* (from *Cantic. vii. 9*), which of all the fantastical titles that I can recollect, is one of the prettiest. It hath a double meaning, of which *Schabtai* was not aware; for most of his rabbinical brethren talk very much like *men in their sleep*.

partly, that I may not be deemed a tame and passive antagonist, in conquering whom there would be no credit. If I fall, I could wish to fall like Hector in Homer, by an honourable hand, and after an honourable resistance :—

Μὴ μὰν ἀσπουδεὶ γε καὶ ἀκλειῶς ἀπολοίμην,
Ἄλλὰ μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι.^{1]}

The greatest sect of the Jews was that of the *Pharisees*, and in many respects it seems to have been the best also. The *Constitutions* charge them with fatalism ; and so doth Epiphanius, and some other ancients ;—a charge which perhaps they could not have made good. They ought rather to have ascribed this notion to the *Essenes* : for the Essenes were strict predestinarians ; but the Pharisees, like the semi-Pelagians, thought that divine assistance and human liberty co-operated, and were reconcilable. So says² Josephus, who was better acquainted with them than the obscure author of the *Constitutions*. The principal fault, in point of doctrine, belonging to the Pharisees, was a zeal for the *traditions of the Elders* ; and though this unwritten law was, as we may well suppose, a heap of lies, nonsense, and superstition, they paid more regard to it, than to the word of God.

But if we consider the ignorance and corruption which then prevailed amongst the Jews, we must acknowledge that the Pharisees and their disciples were by no means the worst part of the nation. St. Paul bears them this testimony : *After the most straitest, or exactest, sect of our religion*, says he, *I lived a Pharisee*³. Our Saviour declares concerning them : *The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat : all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe and do, that observe and do ; but do not ye after their works, for they say and do not*.⁴ In many places of Scripture, where it is said, *Do this, but do not that*, or, *This shall be, but that shall not be* ; the words are to be understood, not *absolutely*, but *comparatively*⁵ : so that the meaning here may be :

¹ Il. x. 304.

² B. J. II. viii. 14. *Antiq.* XIII. v. 9 ; XVIII. i. 3. *The Pharisees*, says Prideaux, *held a free-will in conjunction with predestination*.

³ Acts xxvi. 5.

⁴ Matt. xxiii. 2.

⁵ Compare Gen. xlv. 8 ; Exod. xvi. 8 ; 1 Sam. xv. 22 ; Joel ii. 13 ; Matt. vi. 19, 20, ix. 13 ; Luke xii. 4, 5 ; John v. 30, vi. 27, vii. 19 ; Col. iii. 2.—EDIT.

Of the two, it is better and safer to do what the ⁶ Scribes and Pharisees *teach*, than what they *do* : for their doctrine, even such as it is, is preferable to their practice, and particularly, when they interpret the precepts of Moses ; that is, the *written* law, not the *oral* law, and the *traditions* of the elders.

The Pharisees asserted the soul's immortality, and a life to come. In this they deserved some praise, when compared with the Sadducees who rejected these doctrines. It is not unreasonable to suppose that this belief, though mixed with erroneous notions, might have an influence upon their behaviour, and make them in some respects, and upon some occasions, better than those who thought that the soul and body perished together.

To this belief and this disbelief of a future state may perhaps be ascribed the different behaviour of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees after the ascension of our Lord : for then the resurrection of Christ, and the general resurrection of the dead, and a day of judgment and retribution was constantly and particularly taught by the apostles ; and therefore the Sadducees were their opposers and persecutors, whilst the Pharisees were more inclined to protect them and side with them, and many of the first Jewish converts to Christianity seem to have consisted of this sect. But as Christ during his ministry often preached against the traditions of the Pharisees, and denounced woes against them, they were his chief adversaries.

It may be asked why Christ did not more frequently censure the faults and errors of the Sadducees, who were worse than the Pharisees. One reason seems to have been this, that the Pharisees were the most numerous and the most learned sect, and had the greatest influence over the common people ; therefore it was most expedient that the reformation should begin amongst them, and that their followers and admirers should be undeceived, and cautioned not to repose too great a confidence in them. Another reason was, because the peculiar defects of that sect soon crept into Christianity, and remain in it to this day ; but

⁶ The Scribes and Pharisees : that is, says a learned friend of mine, the *Scribes* who were so by their profession, and were *Pharisees* by their sect. The *Pharisees*, as *Pharisees*, did not sit in the seat of Moses ; the *Scribes* did, whether Pharisees or not.

the ' Sadducees were a sect which declined and came to nothing, or to very little, after the destruction of Jerusalem. Most of the Sadducees who escaped that calamity, probably became apostates and Pagans, a change for which they were too well prepared; and most of the Jews at this time are of the sect of the Pharisees.

The bad character, which is given in the Scriptures of the Pharisees, ought not to be extended to all who were of that party. It is enough if the majority of them, if the most eminent in authority, were very wicked. There were without question several among them, mistaken in many things, and carried into faults by the prevailing notions of the sect, yet men of sincerity, and of virtuous dispositions.

*Notre Seigneur a témoigné plus de mépris contre les Pharisiens, que contre les Sadducéens. C'est aux Pharisiens qu'il en veut en tout et par tout, c'est contre eux qu'il lance ses plus sévères censures, c'est eux qu'il tâche de décrier. Pourquoi cela? C'est qu'encore qu'ils fussent plus orthodoxes, ils avoient le cœur plus gâté d'hypocrisie et d'orgueil, ce qui les rendoit plus incapables de se convertir à l'Evangile*⁸. I think the reasons which I have assigned are more probable than these.

As to the *Essenes*, who are said in the Constitutions to have adhered to the religious rites and customs of their ancestors, and who are never mentioned by the sacred writers⁹, it is well known that they neglected some ceremonial laws, and that they observed many foolish austerities, many fantastical and superstitious institutions of their own. Thus, for example, they accounted it a heinous crime to ease nature on the Sabbath-day, as Josephus testifies; who should also have informed us what they did in cases of urgent necessity, which will sometimes happen. As the Sabbatic river, mentioned by Josephus¹, was dry for six days, and flowed plentifully on the seventh; so, on the contrary, the Essenes were open for six days, and shut on the seventh. But some of the learned think that this marvellous and most reli-

⁷ Justin indeed mentions the Sadducees in his *Dial.* with *Trypho*. See Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, ii. 7.

⁸ Bayle, *Pensées diverses*, § 186.

⁹ There is probably an allusion to the *Essenes* in Matt. xix. 12. See also Col. ii. 18, 23; 1 Tim. iv. 3. They seem to have furnished the model of early Christian monachism.—EDIT.

¹ B. J. vii. 5.

gious river flowed at other times, and rested on the Sabbath, and that there is a fault in the text of Josephus². If so, the parallel is better between the *Fluvius Sabbaticus* and the *Podex Sabbaticus*.

The Essenes, says Josephus,³ on the Sabbath-day οὐδὲ σκευὸς τι μετακινήσαι θαρρόουσιν, οὐδὲ ἀποπατεῖν, *neque vas ullum loco movere audent, nec alvum exonerare*. Porphyry⁴ says of them, Τοσαύτη δ' ἐστὶν αὐτῶν ἡ λιτότης ἡ περὶ τὸν δόλαιαν καὶ ἡ ὀλιγότης, ὥς ἐν τῇ ἐβδομάδι μὴ δεῖσθαι κενώσεως, ἣν τηρεῖν εἰώθασιν εἰς ὕμνους τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ εἰς ἀνάπausιν. *Et quidem tanta ipsorum est in victu frugalitas atque parcimonia, ut ne septimana quidem integra egerendi sit ulla necessitas: quam sibi abstinentiæ legem dixere, partim ut ad hymnos Deo concinendos aptiores sint, partim ut faciliori utantur somno*. Vigerus, the translator, though he was a learned man, fell into an absence of mind, which will sometimes happen to us all, and did not perceive that ἐβδομάς here means, not *a week*, but the *Sabbath-day*; by which mistake he was led from one error into another to the end of the sentence, and made the Essenes wonderful people indeed, and like Milton's angels, who void what they eat by insensible perspiration. The sense is: *The Essenes used so plain and spare a diet, that they had no occasion to disburden on the Sabbath; a day which they kept as a day of rest, and which they spent in singing religious hymns*.

The Essenes and Pharisees agreed in one respect very well; in being superstitious observers of trifles: and the author of the Constitutions seems to have had some portion of the same spirit. *La nation Judaïque a été livrée à un tel esprit de puériles et de chimériques observances, que leurs plus graves docteurs ont étendu le Rituel jusques aux actions les plus machinales, comme est celle d'aller au privé. Malheur à qui ne sçait pas bien s'orienter; car les quatre points cardinaux de l'horison ne sont pas également favorables. Je ne puis dire qu'en Latin le reste de leurs ridicules superstitions*. Dixit R. Akiba, ingressus sum aliquando post Rabbi Josuam in sedis secretæ locum, et tria ab eo didici. Didici 1, quod non versus orientem et occidentem, sed versus

² See the notes there.

³ B. J. ii. 8.

⁴ Apud Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* ix. 3.

septentrionem et austrum convertere nos debeamus. Didici 2, quod non in pedes erectum, sed jam considentem, se retegere liceat. Didici 3, quod podex non dextra sed sinistra manu abstergendus sit. Ad hæc objecit ibi Ben Hasas,—Usque adeo vere perfricuisti frontem erga magistrum tuum, ut cacantem observares? Respondit ille,—Legis hæc arcana sunt, ad quæ discenda id necessario mihi agendum fuit. *Ex Barajetha, etc. Voilà un merveilleux docteur, qui, même sur sa chaise percée, expliquoit sans dire mot les mystères de la Loi.*⁵

Hammond,⁶ speaking of the diseases and torments, which in the Apostolical times seized those persons who were excommunicated, and delivered up to Satan, says, *Josephus simile quidpiam inter Essenos fuisse dicit, his verbis, etc.* Upon which Le Clerc remarks:—*Quod Josephus de Essenis refert, id potest ita intelligi, ut excommunicatus ex mœrore interiisse dicatur, non miraculosa vi excommunicationis; quod tamen si credidisset Josephus, non esset nefas ei fidem abrogare.* It happens well for Josephus, that he has not affirmed so foolish a thing. He only says, *Τοὺς δὲ ἐπ' ἀξιοχρέοις ἁμαρτήμασιν ἀλόντας ἐκβάλλουσι τοῦ τάγματος· ὁ δὲ ἐκκριθεὶς, οἰκτίστῳ πολλάκις μόρῳ διαφθείρεται. Τοῖς γὰρ ὅρκοις καὶ τοῖς ἔθεσιν ἐνδεδεμένος, οὐδὲ τῆς παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις τροφῆς δύναται μεταλαμβάνειν, पोηφαγῶν δὲ καὶ λιμῷ τὸ σῶμα τηκόμενος διαφθείρεται. Διὸ δὴ πολλοὺς ἐλεήσαντες ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἀναπνοαῖς ἀνέλαβον, ἱκανὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασιν αὐτῶν τὸν μέχρι θανάτου βάσανον ἡγούμενοι.*⁷ We see here that the excommunicated Essenes died, neither of any miraculous distemper, nor yet of grief, but were starved to death, because they dared not to eat with other people, being bound by the oaths which they had taken:—oaths which were superstitious, stupid, and unlawful.

One branch of the Essenes had a most uncharitable opinion of the female sex, and thought that a woman could scarcely be found, who was faithful to her husband; and therefore they would not marry. How could they observe the commandment which says, *Honour thy father and thy mother*, who entertained such hard sentiments of their mothers?

It is a conjecture of Van Dale, which, whether it be true or not, is ingenious and plausible, that Sadduceism owed its birth

⁵ Bayle, *Dict.* v. AKIBA.

⁶ In his notes on 1 Cor. v. 5.

⁷ B. J. II. viii. 8.

to the traditional doctrines of the Jews. These traditions were so excessively impertinent, such quintessential, treble-refined folly; and yet so dogmatically enforced by haughty Pharisees and prating Doctors, as importances; that some of the nation, who could not endure to be treated at this overbearing rate, rebelled, and became Freethinkers, and flew out as far into the opposite extreme, and rejected the soul's immortality, as a doctrine not clearly delivered in the Scriptures, supported by tradition, and proceeding from that muddy fountain of everlasting nonsense. Miserable spirit of contradiction! Because a man would deprive me of common sense, I must, in resentment, throw away my religion! This is fulfilling in a very bad way the precept, *If any man will take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.*⁸

The Constitutions forbid Christians to wear a gold ring, and to shave their beards, which must have disgusted the Roman knights, and the Roman barbers. The true reason of the latter prohibition is this:—it is said in *Levit. xix. 27. Neither shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard.* It is a wonder that they did not command Christians to keep the back door shut on Sundays according to the laudable custom of the Essenes.

The Constitutions, from the beginning to the end, turn Christianity into a mere Ceremonial Law.⁹

They prove the resurrection by the pretty amusing story of the *Phœnix*; ¹ though indeed they warrant not the truth of it,

⁸ Matt. v. 40.

⁹ i. 3.

¹ And yet even honest Herodotus, who was inclined enough to give into the marvellous, rejected the story of the Phoenix:—*ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, κ. τ. λ.* (ii. 73).

[Clement of Rome, in his genuine epistle (c. 25), has employed the story of the phoenix in illustration of the doctrine of a future resurrection; and Tertullian, Ambrose, and many other Christian writers, use precisely the same argument in proof of the same fact. The story indeed was very generally believed, and gave rise to divers discussions about the time that Clement wrote; and not only has his cotemporary Pliny (N. H. x. 2) recorded it, but Tacitus also (Ann. vi. 28), though, treating it in some degree as a fable, he observes, *aspici aliquando in Ægypto eam volucrem non ambigitur.* It was not unnatural, therefore, that Clement should adopt it, though a vulgar superstition, as an illustration of the doctrine which he was anxious to establish. Whether he believed it, or not, is of little consequence; he knew it to be generally believed: and those who did not withhold their credit from a prodigy so questionable, could not with any consistency deny the possibility of a resurrection. Clement was probably, however, as credulous as others; but if his credulity is to raise an

but introduce the phoenix with an ὡς αὐτοί φασι. And they cite the *Sibylline Oracles* as prophecies, and ten verses from them, which clearly foretel the resurrection of the dead, the conflagration of the world, and the judgment at the last day, and which are manifestly the manufacture of a Christian :

Ἄλλ' ὅπότε ἤδη πάντα τέφρασποδοέσσα γένηται,
 Καὶ πῦρ κοιμίση Θεὸς ἄφθιτος, ὅσπερ ἀνῆψεν,
 Ὅστέα καὶ σποδιὴν αὐτὸς Θεὸς ἔμπαλιν ἄνδρα
 Μορφώση, στήσῃ δὲ βροτοὺς πάλιν ὡς πάρος ἦσαν·
 Καὶ τότε δὴ κρίσις ἔσται, ἐφ' ἣν δικάσει Θεὸς αὐτὸς,
 Κρίνων ἔμπαλιν κόσμον· ὅσοι δ' ὑπὸ δυσσεβίῃσιν
 Ἠμαρτον θνητοί, τοὺς δ' αὖ πάλι γαῖα καλύψει,
 Ὅσσοι δ' εὐσεβέουσιν, πάλιν ζήσονται ἐν κόσμῳ,
 Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ δόντος, ζώην θ' ἅμα καὶ χάριν αὐτοῖς
 Εὐσεβέσιν· πάντες τέ τότε εἰσόψονται ἑαυτούς.²

It is remarkable that the author of the Constitutions, who thus cites the Sibyl as a prophetess of good authority; at least as one fit to convince the Pagans; yet treats her with contempt (according to some copies), and calls her, not Σιβύλλα, but Ἀβύλλα, or *crazy fool*; which reading Cotelierius has admitted into the text. If the *old woman* had been alive, she might have replied to *Pseudo-Clemens*,—*Parcius ista, Pater, tamen objicienda memento.*

It would not be suitable to good manners to reproach a lady for pronouncing or spelling a word wrong, and therefore I am almost afraid to observe that in the second line the prophetess has made a false quantity; for the *penultima* in κοιμίση is short. Perhaps the place was corrupted by the librarian, with whom we make free, and call him a blunderer. He should have written κοιμήση, or κοιμίσση. In Homer *Odyss.* M. 372, some editions give us Ἡ με μάλ' εἰς ἄτην κοιμίσσατε νηλεῖ ὕπνῳ. But there it has been changed into κοιμήσατε. Menander also, *Fragm.* p. 2, has Ἐκαστος ἡμῶν καὶ συνηγωνίσσατο, which Bentley changed into συνηγωνίζετο. Le Clerc endeavoured in vain to defend the common reading against him by the passage in Homer cited above. Le Clerc has committed some faults in his edition of

exception against the genuineness of his epistle, which is established in the proper place, it will be no easy task to vindicate the writings of most of the Fathers from a similar imputation.—EDIT.]

² Sib. Or. v. 7. Κρίνων κόσμον, is Ecclesiastical Greek.

Menander and *Philemon*, because he had not sufficiently considered the laws of prosody : but they who made those laws their study, and reproached him for his ignorance of them, were not able to keep themselves free from such faults ; as might easily be showed. The small and trifling blemishes of this kind in *Le Clerc* are covered and amply compensated by other productions, for which he deserves, and will receive praise and honour :—*Th' estate which wits inherit after death.*

It were easy to make many more objections to the Constitutions, but ³ others have done it sufficiently, and perhaps it is not right to wage war with the dead. *Nullum cum victis certamen et æthere cassis.*

IX. ON THE APOSTOLICAL CANONS.

The *Apostolical Canons*, though some of them may be ancient, and composed in the second and third centuries, are not apostolical, in the strict sense of the word, and are interpolated in several places ; as *Beveridge* himself confesses, who undertook their defence, and made the most he could of them ⁴.

Canon. I. Ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ Ἐπισκόπων χειροτονείσθω δύο ἢ τριῶν.

*Quinque doctores et prophetas Antiochiæ congregatos esse traditur : Barnabam, Symeonem Nigrum, Lucium, Manahem, et Saulum.*⁵—*Dicebat Spiritus sanctus, Ἀφορίσατε δὴ μοι τὸν τε*

³ See *Turner's Discourse on the Constitutions*. [See also *Riddle's Christian Antiquities*, p. 120 ; *Augusti's Antiquities of the Christian Church*, i. 4 ; and *Otto Krabbe über den Ursprung et Inhalt der Apost. Const. des Clemens Rom.* Hamburg. 1829.—EDIT.]

⁴ See his *Cod. Can. Vindic.* i. 10. 4. [The *Apostolical Canons*, as well as *Constitutions*, have been attributed to *Clemens Romanus* ; but the first appeal to them, under this title, is found in the records of the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 394. They seem, however, to have been referred to by writers of an earlier date ; and an apparent identity of design, as well as other internal marks of resemblance, plainly affix them either to the compiler of the *Constitutions*, or of a writer influenced by the same views. The regulations which they enforce were very generally observed in the Church during the early part of the third century ; and though the last thirty-five canons are known to have been a subsequent appendage, the first fifty possess some considerable value as a guide to the discipline of the Church at the period of their supposed compilation. It is remarkable that in the list which they give of the canonical books of the New Testament the *Apocalypse* is omitted, but the *two Epistles of Clement*, and the *Apostolical Constitutions* are inserted. See *Augusti's Antiquities*, i. 4 ; *Otto Krabbe de Codice Canonum qui Apostolorum nomine circumferuntur* ; Goetting. 1829 ; and *Regenbruht de Canonibus Apostolorum* ; Vratish. 1828.—EDIT.]

⁵ Act. xiii. 1.

Βαρνάβαν καὶ τὸν Σαῦλον: *et protinus subjungitur, τότε νηστεύσαντες καὶ προσευξάμενοι καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν. E quinque igitur hic congregatis duo, Barnabas et Saulus, ordinati sunt: reliqui sunt ergo tres soli qui ordinarunt. Chrysostomus autem in locum ait, ὅρα πάλιν ὑπὸ τίνων χειροτονεῖται, ὑπὸ Λουκείου καὶ Μαραῆ, ac si Symeon ordinationi non interesset. Sed intererat haud dubie; quod etiam exinde constat, quod non in duali sed plurali numero dicitur, νηστεύσαντες, προσευξάμενοι, ἐπιθέντες, adeo ut tres tunc temporis, non plures, nec pauciores, ordines conferebant⁶.* To all these arguments I choose to say nothing: I only make a small grammatical remark, that in Greek, a verb in the plural is frequently joined to two nominative cases singular, and a participle plural with two substantives singular; and that the dual number is not once used in all the New Testament, which Beveridge had forgotten, or had not observed.

What sort of opinion Beveridge had, concerning the authority of these Canons, and whether he thought that Christians were obliged to observe them, is not very material to know. He seems to have entertained a great veneration for them. He says that, by establishing the antiquity of the Canons, *hoc etiam boni commodique et nobis et aliis quibuscunque, se primitivorum Christianorum moribus conformes gerere cupientibus, emerget; quod præ oculis habeamus, qua ratione vitam nostram ad eorum exemplar instituamus*⁷. Now the primitive Christians deserve to be honoured on many accounts, and imitated in many things, and the same ought to be said of this learned and pious bishop; but, after all that can be said, the authors of these Canons were fallible men; and it would be better for a Christian to take the precepts of Christ, and the undoubted writings of the apostles, for the rule of his faith and practice, and to conform to primitive Christianity just as far as primitive Christianity is conformable to Scripture and to reason, and not to ascribe a sacred and apostolical authority to a set of unknown canon and constitution-makers.

Beveridge ascribes a kind of apostolical authority to the 50th Canon, which requires of the bishops and Presbyters that they should make use of a threefold immersion in baptism, under pain of being deposed. *Aliquo tamen modo, says he, id ab Apos-*

⁶ Beveridge.⁷ P. 76.

tolis traditum negare non ausi sumus; utpote quod a sanctis Patribus nec semel assertum legimus. The testimony of the Fathers, in matters of tradition, is not always to be depended upon.⁸ But did our author himself use to conform to this canon?

The 69th Canon strictly requires the observation of the quadragesimal fast under spiritual pains and penalties; and this, together with other stated fasts, Beveridge takes to have been of apostolical institution. It is not probable that the apostles enjoined such things, as absolutely necessary: things of that kind are more properly subjects for counsels than for precepts. To be temperate, and to keep the passions and appetites in due subjection, is the duty of all men: abstinence from food is so far good as it is found to conduce to this end; but what suits one climate, and one constitution, and one age of life, suits not another.

The legislative spirit began to operate betimes, and when the Church made laws, relating to doctrines and opinions, which were not to be found in the New Testament, the *codex* became very bulky, and there was no end of law-making. How should there?⁹ Somebody once asked a scholar, what was the meaning

⁸ By different parties, and for different purposes, the authority of the Fathers has been variously estimated; and while some would raise them above their legitimate importance, others are eager to consign them to undeserved neglect. Their real value lies between the two extremes. They are by no means to be exalted to an equality with the Scriptures, and to be taken as infallible guides in matters of faith; neither are they to be thrown aside as utterly unworthy of attention, and as dealers in pious frauds and legendary fables. A just and impartial estimate of their merit was taken by our venerable reformers; and the relative weight which belongs to the testimony of different ages, has been fairly determined by our ablest and soundest divines. After the Council of Nice, a class of writers sprung up, greatly inferior to their predecessors, in whatever light their pretensions are viewed. Sadly deficient in learning, prejudiced in opinion, and inelegant in style, they cannot be admitted for a moment into competition with those who were contemporary with the apostles and their immediate successors, and had the best opportunities of information on any point of difficulty, whether in respect of doctrine or of discipline. It is true that even the ante-Nicene Fathers are not always to be relied on in the interpretation of Scripture. Their comments are sometimes fanciful, and their expositions irrelevant and obscure. But as witnesses to *matters of fact*, and to the antiquity of divers practices still retained in the Church, their testimony is highly valuable and important. They might be, and doubtless *were*, frequently deceived in opinion; but deceivers they *were not*: and, if *not always to be depended on* in matters of tradition, their works may safely be regarded as honest records of the primitive Church, and faithful mirrors of the religious complexion of their times.—EDIT.

⁹ "The Roman law," says Blackstone, "had grown to so great a bulk, or as Livy

of ff, which stands for the *Digests* or *Pandects*,¹ and was told that it meant *Farrago Farraginum*. The answer was not in earnest; nor am I: but Tacitus says somewhere, *Corruptissima Republica; plurimæ leges*. And so much for this subject.

XI.—ON THE SIBYLLINE ORACLES.

THE SIBYLLINE ORACLES were composed at different times, by different persons, first by Pagans, and then perhaps by Jews, and certainly by Christians.²

Justin Martyr³ mentions the Sibyl as clearly foretelling the coming and the actions of Christ. *His verbis*, says the last editor,⁴ *Sibyllini, quales hodie extant, libri indicantur, in quibus tam aperta est rerum a Christo gerendarum prædictio, ut eam ex eventis fictam fuisse vix quisquam hodie non fateatur*:⁵—and in the notes, *Nihil sane suspicatus est Justinus, quamvis omnes horum librorum paginae fraudem clamitent*. Thus the Benedictine, compelled by hard necessity; who would have defended both the Sibylline Oracles, and his friend Justin who cited them, if he had been able. It ought however to be observed that some persons, of at least as much learning and as much judgment as he, have suspected the genuineness of the *Cohortatio*.⁶

The Sibylline Oracles seem to have been all, from first to last,

(iii. 34) expresses it, *tam immensus aliarum super alias acervatarum legum cumulus*, that they were computed to be many camels' load, by an author who preceded Justinian." (Comment. Introd. § 3.)—EDIT.

¹ The *Pandects* (πᾶν δέχεσθαι) were a *Digest* of the opinions of the lawyers of antiquity, compiled by Tritonian, a celebrated Roman juris-consult, and sixteen coadjutors. They comprised extracts from more than two thousand volumes, and were intended as a commentary on the celebrated Code of Justinian, by whose command this laborious task was undertaken. The work embodied the substance of 9123 laws, divided into 50 books and 422 sections. It was published A.D. 533. The mark "ff" does not indicate the *Pandects* themselves, but the *folios* or pages, to which a reference may happen to be made.—EDIT.

² See the collections concerning them made by Fabricius (*Bibl. Gr.* i. p. 167); an author whose memory all the learned world ought to bless, and to whom they should wish

— *tenuem et sine pondere terram,*

Spirantesque crocos, et in urna perpetuum ver.

³ Cohort. ad Græcos, c. 38.

⁴ *Prudentius Maranus*, the Benedictine editor of Justin's works, printed at Paris in 1742. An excellent edition of the genuine works of this Father has lately been published in Germany, by J. C. T. Otto.—EDIT.

⁵ Præf. p. lxx.

⁶ See below, p. 177.

and without any one exception, mere impostures. We have a collection of them in eight books, which abound with phrases, words, facts, and passages taken from the LXX. and the New Testament; and are a remarkable specimen of astonishing impudence, and miserable poetry.

It was a pleasant conceit of Possevin, in his *Apparatus sacer*, that a choice ought to be made of passages from these Oracles, with proper notes, which might be used in schools. It would greatly perplex any man of learning to make a choice where all is so bad: he would be like *Buridan's ass* between two bundles of *musty hay*.

Is. Vossius, the patron of Sibylline Oracles,—*forged*, as he pretended, by *divinely inspired Jews*,—would yet have given them up as bad compositions, and void of all elegance. *Siquis*, says he, *Græcos qui supersunt Judæorum consulat versus, prorsus illos similes fuisse inveniet, ac fuere veterum Christianorum carmina; quæ, si unum et alterum excipias, istiusmodi sunt, ut Scaliger sibi in sterquilinio versari videretur, quotiescunque ad ea legenda se conferret.*⁷ This is true enough. Nor does he attempt to defend the present collection. *Quæ olim a Patribus Christianis lecta fuere, et etiamnum supersunt et leguntur oracula, longe a me abest ut omnia ea ejusdem generis et auctoritatis esse existimem, ac fuere ea de quibus hactenus sumus locuti. In his quippe quæ Christi nativitatem præcessere, Sibyllinis ea solum continebantur, quæ ex Prophetarum scriptis deprompta essent vaticinia. At vero in illis, quæ vulgo leguntur, ea quoque occurrunt, quæ non ab aliis, quam ab iis, potuerunt conscribi, qui centum et viginti demum annis Christo fuere posteriores.* And he concludes that the old Oracles were enlarged and interpolated by Christians.⁸

⁷ De Sybill. Or. c. 9.

⁸ Ibid. c. 8. [In the Paris edition of the *Oracles*, edited by J. Opsopæus (1589), the following note occurs at p. 683: *Ad horum imperatorum (Antonini Pii cum liberis suis M. Aurelio et Lucio Vero) tempora videntur Sibyllarum vaticinia tantum extendi; id quod etiam e libro v. videri licet.* The fifth book more especially exhibits the spirit of exultation with which the Sibyls are made to denounce the fall of Paganism, and the impending destruction of the Roman empire. In the eighth book also the language and sentiments of the Christians of this period are distinctly traced. Of the first and second books the greater part is little else than the Mosaic history in Greek hexameters, probably composed by Alexandrian Jews, who had acquired sufficient taste for the poetry of the Greeks, to induce them to translate their sacred

Mention is made by various writers of a Sibyl, who prophesied before the Trojan war; and from whom Homer took many lines, and particularly this prophecy:

Nûν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείας βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει,
Καὶ παῖδες παίδων, τοί κεν μετόπισθε μένωνται.¹

Which Virgil thus imitates, and accommodates to his own plan:

Hic domus Æneæ cunctis dominabitur oris,
Et nati natorum, et qui nascentur ab illis.²

Others have said that Homer himself was endued with a prophetic spirit when he wrote those lines. Others have observed a great affinity of style between Homer and the Sibylline verses, and thence have concluded that the poet was a plagiarist.³ Strange! that men of letters could talk at this idle rate. Of all the ancient poets, Homer, who has a great simplicity, is perhaps the most easy to be imitated in point of bare diction and versification; and many persons are capable of closely copying him, or some other poet, as to style and numbers, who have no bright genius or invention, and are incapable of composing an elegant poem: but after all, the Sibylline Oracles are just as like Homer, as the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* are like *Cicero's* Epistles to *Atticus*.

Homer's prophecy is indeed remarkable, and might afford some observations not quite so childish as those above mentioned. We may conjecture,

1. That the poet went to Troy, *i. e.* to the region so called, and carefully surveyed the place, and the country about it; and indeed in his *Iliad* he paints and describes,⁴ as one who knew

records into the language of Homer. It is only in the third book that any vestiges of the Pagan oracles are to be found; and these are manifestly very largely interpolated by the Christians. The forgery indeed is palpable throughout; and the threatening tone of the predictions indicate a far less judicious than zealous attempt to facilitate the conversion of the heathen. See Prideaux's *Connexion*, p. 2, b. 9. (vol. ii. pp. 671-686, Oxf. ed.); Birger Thorlacius *de libris Sibyllistarum Veteris Ecclesiæ* (Hanv. 1815); Tschirner's *Fall des Heidenthums*; and Greswell on the *Parables* (v. ii. 8).—EDIT.]

¹ Il. τ. 307.

² Virg. Æn. iii. 97.

³ Clemens Alexandrinus charges Homer with taking verses from Orpheus and Musæus, instead of suspecting that these were later writers, under false names, who pillaged Homer. (*Strom.* vi. pp. 738, 751.)

⁴ Il. B. 811. Ἔστι δὲ τις προπάροιθε πόλεως αἰπεῖα κολῶνη.

every spot of ground.—2. That the residue of the Trojans, after the departure of the Greeks, assembled together and settled in their own country, under Æneas.—3. That when Homer came to Troy, a prince reigned there who was descended from Æneas, and might be his grandson.—4. That this prince treated Homer kindly, and gave him some memoirs and informations concerning the Trojan chiefs, and particularly concerning his own ancestor.—5. That therefore Homer frequently celebrates Æneas, as the son of a goddess, a warrior of great bravery, and of an amiable character, and one much favoured and beloved by the gods. He also mentions some particularities concerning him, as that Priamus⁵ did not love and honour him according to his deserts.—6. That Homer lived at least ninety years after the Trojan war.⁶

The most ancient writer who speaks of the Sibyl is Heraclitus, about 500 years before Christ, after which she and her predictions are mentioned by Aristophanes, Plato, Aristotle, and who not.

The sum of the judgment which Fabricius, after a diligent examination, formed upon this subject, is as follows:—

I. *Nothing is more uncertain than what is related of the number of the Sibyls, whether there was one or more.*

II. *Concerning the Sibyls, some think that they were inspired of God, others that they were possessed by evil spirits, others that they were assisted by a strong imagination and enthusiasm, and a kind of natural divination: to which must be added a fourth opinion, that these oracles were all fraud and human imposture, and that if any of them were ever fulfilled, it was by hazard.*

III. *It seems an assertion too confident, to ascribe all the prophecies of the Sibyl and of other Pagans to knavery or chance, and it is more reasonable to suppose that sometimes there might be something præternatural in the case.*

IV. *In the time of Cicero there were some Sibylline Oracles which were Acrostics, and which, as Cicero observes, were the*

⁵ Il. N. 460.—αἰεὶ γὰρ Πριάμῳ ἐπεμήνιε δίῳ,

οὐνεκ' ἄρ' ἐσθλὸν ἔοντα μετ' ἀνδράσιν οὔτι τίεσκεν.

⁶ [See the note on the above passage of Homer, and the first preliminary observation in my edition of the *Iliad*.—EDIT.]

labour of a plodding impostor, and not the prophecy of an inspired person.

V. *The Romans had Sibylline Oracles in the time of their kings, which were kept with great care in the Capitol, and consulted afterwards upon important occasions. They were burnt with the Capitol, A.U.C. 670, and the Romans got a new collection from various places.*

VI. *This second collection was burnt by Stilicho in the time of Honorius.*

VII. *Besides these collections, there were other Sibylline oracles made and handed about from time to time.*

VIII. *In Virgil's fourth Eclogue (v. 3.—Ultima Cumæi venit jam carminis ætas :) Carmen Cumæum probably means Hesiod's poem, as Probus thinks; and ultima ætas is the same as prima, and means the Saturnian times, and the golden age: Or, ultima ætas means the last, the iron age; and then venit is fuit, præterit, is passed and gone. Virgil took nothing here from the Sibylline oracles.*

IX. *Our present collection contains not the books which were offered to Tarquin;*

X. *Nor the second set of oracles which were brought to Rome;*

XI. *Nor those oracles which were received by the Pagans.*

XII. *Nothing contained in it ought to be admitted as made before the birth of Christ, unless we can find as ancient vouchers for it.*

XIII. *There are in this collection some lines which the author took from old Pagan oracles, from Homer, Orpheus, and other poets;*

XIV. *But much is taken from the Old and New Testament.*

XV. *It contains not all the Sibylline oracles of which the Fathers made use, but it has the greater part of them.*

XVI. *These oracles were forged in the first, second, and third centuries, not by Pagans, or Jews, but by heretics or orthodox Christians; not by the Fathers, but by some unknown persons.*

XVII. *There was no law which made it a capital crime to read these Sibylline oracles.*

Such is the sentiment of Fabricius, who would have granted that there is not extant one Sibylline oracle, upon which we can depend as upon a prophecy fairly uttered before the event,

and plainly accomplished. I see not why we should have a more favourable opinion of those which are lost.

The great difference of words and verses which appears even in the same passages of the Sibylline oracles, as they are cited by different Fathers, shows that the collections of these poems varied much; and that every librarian thrust in what he thought proper, and what he had picked up here and there from any dunghill.

Amongst the defenders of the Sibylline oracles was Isaac Vossius, who wrote a book on that subject,—a learned book, for he could write no other: but as to judgment, you must not seek it there. *Credimus*, says he, *omnes istos libros* (Apocryphos) *a Judæis fuisse compositos, DEO IMPELLENTE IPSORUM MENTES ad significandum gentibus Christi adventum. Infinita itaque illi edidere volumina, partim sub patriarcharum et prophetarum suorum nominibus, quales fuere libri qui olim lecti fuere sub nominibus Adami, Enochi, Abrahami, Moysis, Eliæ, Esaiæ, et Jeremiæ; partim vero sub nominibus illorum, quorum magna apud gentiles esset existimatio, veluti Hystaspis, Mercurii Trismegisti, Zoroastris, Sibyllarum, Orphei, Phocylidæ, et complurium aliorum.*⁵ It must be owned to have been a generous proceeding in Vossius, to take the weaker side on several occasions, and to be an advocate for those who stood most in need of assistance, in which charitable behaviour he has been, and will be imitated; for this sort of *charity* also *never faileth*: but for inventing and maintaining paradoxes, he never had an equal, except father Harduin.

Virgil's fourth Eclogue was written, as Bishop Chandler and Mr. Masson have observed, when Pollio was consul; and the design of it was to compliment Augustus, or Cæsar Octavianus, as he was then called, and to foretell the birth of a son whom his wife Scribonia should bear, who was then with child: but it proved a daughter, and the infamous Julia.⁶ In the third line, *Ultima* means *postrema* and *prima*, the *fifth* and *last* in order, and the *first*, that is, the returning *golden age*. Virg. *Æn.* vii. 48. *isque parentem Te, Saturne, refert; tu sanguinis ultimus auctor.* —*Venit* means *is come*: it is contrary to the genius of the Latin

⁵ De Sibyl. Or. c. 7.

⁶ See Chandler's *Def. of Christ.* and *Vindicat.*; and, at the end, a *Dissertation* of Masson.

tongue to interpret it *abiit*. Collins follows Fabricius in giving this latter sense to the verb. It is pity he did not follow him in many other points, where he would have found him a good guide. *Venit* in the present tense is, *it is coming*; *venit* in the præterperfect, *it is come*: unless when it stands for an aorist, ἦλθε, and means, *it came*. *Fuit* indeed often denotes what *was*, and *is not*. *Fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium*. To avoid saying that a man was dead, the Romans said *Fuit*, by an *euphemismus*.—*Cumæum carmen* cannot be the poem of Hesiod; for Virgil calls him *Ascræum senem*, and his poems *Ascræum carmen*. It must be, as Servius interprets it, *Carmen Sibyllinum*.

Hence we may suppose that in Virgil's time there were said to be Sibylline oracles, which mentioned the return of the golden age, and a renovation of happy days: but whether these oracles were forged by a Jew, or by a Pagan, or whether the substance of them were stolen from the Holy Scriptures, or whether Virgil borrowed any of his ideas and expressions from these oracles, is a matter of doubt and uncertainty. It cannot be denied that there is a great resemblance between Virgil's Eclogue and the sacred prophecies.⁷

Virgil's fourth Eclogue is a continued prophecy, and he must be supposed, for the sake of the *decorum*, to have acquired this foresight one way or other; else the poem would appear ridiculous. He gives no intimation that he was himself inspired,—I speak of prophetic, not of poetic inspiration;—and father Hesiod was no predictor of future events, so that from him he could not pretend to learn it. Whence then could he feign to have it, but from *old oracles*, from the *Cumæum carmen*? If he had set up on this occasion for a prophet, he would have spoiled his compliment: it was better to represent himself as only an interpreter of ancient prophecies, which he adorned with the graces of Latin poesy. This gave the Eclogue an air of importance and authority.⁸

Virgil pronounces that the *golden age* should commence under

⁷ See Bp. Chandler's *Def.* p. 10, &c.

⁸ Possibly the materials of the *Pollio* may have been supplied to Virgil by the versions of Scripture produced by the Alexandrian Jews; to whom the *Ezekiel Tragedy* and other pieces, as well as the early portion of the *Sibylline verses*, are due. See Valeknaer's *Dissertation de Aristobulo Judæo*.—EDIT.

Augustus, and at the birth of his son; and should be brought to perfection when the young hero should arrive to manhood, and when his father (as the reader was left to suppose) was returned to heaven, and become one of the celestial gods. He has touched upon the same subject in other places: let us compare them together. In the *Georgics*, he declares,⁹ that Augustus, when he should leave the earth, would become a god, one of the *Dii majorum gentium*.

Tuque adeo, quem mox quæ sint habitura deorum
Concilia, incertum est, &c.

And¹

Jampridem nobis cœli te regia, Cæsar,
Invidet.

He intimates,² that Augustus should restore peace and happiness, and that he was intended—*eversa succurrere sæclo*. Again in the 6th *Æneid*, the *Sibyl*, the *Cumæan virgin* and *prophetess*, leads Æneas to Elysium, where he learns that Augustus should arise and bring with him the *golden age*:

Hic vir, hic est, tibi quem promitti sæpius audis:
Augustus Cæsar, Divi genus; aurea condet
Sæcula qui rursus Latio:—³

promitti, that is, *foretold* by the gods and their prophets. And again⁴,

Hujus in adventum jam nunc et Caspia regna
Responsis horrent divûm——

My inference from these things is that Virgil by *Cumæum carmen* meant a Sibylline oracle; but I say not that he took anything thence, besides a renovation and a golden age.

Virgil certainly paid no sincere regard to the Sibyl, and to her predictions. The Epicurean philosophy, in his days, had debauched the wits and the polite world; and he, as well as his friend Horace, was infected with it: but Virgil saw plainly that the atheistical system would make a poor figure in heroic poetry, and therefore has introduced it sparingly and obliquely. They who deny his Epicurism, are persons with whom it would be a folly to dispute.

Not only the Sibylline oracles are to be rejected, but there is

⁹ Georg. i. 24.

¹ 503.

² 500.

³ Æn. 792.

⁴ 799.

reason to suspect *the Orphic verses*, and also some few of the fragments of ancient poets produced by the Fathers, to have been forged or interpolated by Jews or Christians. Such are the Orphic verses cited by Justin⁵, and by others:—Φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστὶ κ. τ. λ. Cudworth declared his doubts concerning them⁶. So also Le Clerc⁷. *Les Pères, au moins Clement Alexandrin, savoient bien que l'on avoit attribué plusieurs choses à Orphée, qui n'en étoient point, et l'on a sujet de doubter qu'ils crussent bien assurément que le passage de l'unité de Dieu fût de lui. Ils ont pu le citer, contre ceux qui pouvoient croire qu'il en étoit effectivement, par un raisonnement, dont les Philosophes même se servent, faute de plus propres à persuader ceux, à qui ils ont à faire, et dont ils disent, valeat quantum poterit valere*⁸.

In Eusebius⁹ these Orphic verses are to be found, as they were produced by Aristobulus.

An oracle of Apollo cited by Justin¹ and by Porphyry,² says :

Μοῦνοι Χαλδαῖοι σοφίην λάχον, ἡδ' ἔρ' Ἑβραῖοι,
 Αὐτογένεθλον ἄνακτα σεβάζομενοι Θεὸν ἄγνῳς.

Here the Pagans and Porphyry³ were the dupes, who took this for a sacred oracle. Justin and Eusebius seem to use it as an *argumentum ad hominem*. Justin reads Θεὸν αὐτόν.

Cæterum, says Le Clerc, *notatu dignissimum est hoc Oraculum, quod neque a Judæo, neque a Christiano, neque etiam ab Ethnico e vulgo fingi potuit*.⁴ Yet it might be made by some fantastical Pagan, who entertained a favourable opinion of the Chaldeans and of the Jews; or rather by some Jew, who was not very scrupulous, and who might join the Chaldeans to the Jews,

⁵ Cohort. c. 15.

⁶ Intell. Syst. p. 300.

⁷ Hist. Eccl. p. 692.

⁸ Le Clerc, Bibl. Chois. xxvii. 438.

⁹ Præp. Evang. xii. 12.

¹ Cohort. c. 11.

² Ap. Euseb. Præp. Evang. ix. 10.

³ Some have suspected, but without sufficient reason, this book of Porphyry to be forged. See a dissertation in Le Clerc (*Bibl. Chois.* xiii. 178), which well deserves to be perused. The author, whom I take to have been Le Clerc himself, acts the part of a moderator between Fontenelle, or Van Dale, and their antagonist, and upon the whole is most inclined to side with the former, though not in everything. He blames the latter for using *figures of rhetoric* instead of *reasons*, treating Van Dale and Fontenelle as *Socinians*, setting the mob at them, and such sort of *pauvretés*. But as great guns are the *ratio ultima regum*, so these are the *ratio ultima disputatorum*, and supply the want of ammunition: and yet it is not altogether fair and honourable war; it is shooting chewed bullets and glass bottles.

⁴ Oper. Phil. tom. ii. in Indice, v. HEBRÆI.

thinking it would remove the suspicion that the Oracle was framed by a Jew. He might also give this honour to the Chaldeans for the sake of his father Abraham, who was a Chaldean. Or it might be the work of some old heretic, or of some foolish Christian. It seems to have been forged in the same shop where the Orphic verses before-mentioned were fabricated. *No one knew God*, says this Orpheus,

Εἰ μὴ μουνογενὴς τις ἀπορῥῶξ φύλου ἄνωθεν
Χαλδαίων.—

By whom, says Clemens, he means Abraham, or his son.⁵ Clemens observes that Orpheus borrowed his thoughts and expressions from the Scriptures, and so far he is certainly in the right.

An Oracle of Apollo, in Lactantius,⁶ says,

Ὄνομα μὴδὲ λόγῳ χωρούμενον, ἐν πυρὶ ναίων,
Τουτὶ Θεός· μικρὰ δὲ Θεοῦ μερὶς ἄγγελοι ἡμεῖς.

Made by a Jew or a Christian.

There are more of the same stamp in Lactantius; and also Sibylline Oracles bearing the most manifest marks of imposture.

Justin,⁷ and others after him, give us these Sibylline verses, which teach the unity of God, and condemn idolatry and sacrifices, and exhort to the love of God, and are altogether in the language of the Scriptures, and carry their own confutation along with them:—

Εἷς Θεός, ὃς μόνος ἐστὶν ὑπερμεγέθης, ἀγέννητος,
Παντοκράτωρ, ἀόρατος, ὁρῶμενος αὐτὸς ἅπαντα·
Αὐτὸς δ' οὐ βλέπεται θνητῆς ὑπὸ σαρκὸς ἀπάσης.

* * * * *
'Ημεῖς δ' ἀθανάτοιο τρίβους πεπλανημένοι ἦμεν,
'Εργα δὲ χειροποίητα γεραίρομεν ἄφρονι θύμῳ,
Εἶδωλα ξοάνων τε καταφθιμένων τ' ἀνθρώπων.

* * * * *
'Ολβιοὶ ἄνθρωποι κεῖνοι κατὰ γαῖαν ἔσονται,
'Οσσοὶ δὲ στέρξουσιν μέγαν Θεόν, εὐλογέοντες
Πρὶν φαγέειν πιέειν τε, πεποιθότες εὐσεβήσιν·
Οἱ νηοὺς μὲν ἅπαντας ἀπαρνήσονται ἰδόντες,
Καὶ βωμοὺς, εἰκαῖα λίθων ἀφιδρύματα κωφῶν,
Αἷμασιν ἐμψύχων μεμιασμένα καὶ θυσίαισι
Τετραπόδων· βλέψουσι δ' ἐνὸς Θεοῦ ἐς μέγα κῦδος.

In the fourth line, instead of *τρίβους*, one might read *ἀθανάτοιο τρίβου*, with *ἀπὸ* understood; which may be translated, *We have*

⁵ Strom. v. p. 723.

⁶ De Fals. Rel. i. 7.

⁷ Cohort. c. 16.

erred from the everlasting path ; but I rather think that ἀθανάτοιο, τρίβου means the path of God, ἀπὸ τῆς τρίβου τοῦ Ἀθανάτου. Psalm xv. 11. Ἐγνώρισάς με ὁδοὺς ζωῆς. Isai. lxiii. 17. Τί ἐπλάνησας ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ σου. Jerem. vi. 16. Στήτε ἐπὶ ταῖς ὁδοῖς, καὶ ἴδετε, καὶ ἐρωτήσατε τρίβους Κυρίου αἰωνίους· καὶ ἴδετε ποία ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀγαθή. And the prophetess says in another place, τρίβον ὀρθὴν Εὐθείαν προλιπόντες.⁸

Justin in his *Dialogue* takes no notice of the Sibyl; in his *Apology* he mentions her as foretelling the conflagration at the last day, and saying many good things; and complains that it was forbidden to read her.⁹ The *Cohortatio* is thought to surpass his other works in elegance of diction; but that alone will hardly be a sufficient reason to pronounce it spurious, though it may justify a suspicion and an hesitation about it. The Benedictine Editor¹ says, *Cum scriberet Cohortationem ad Graecos Justinus, credebatur Septuaginta illos Viros, dum pro se quisque separatim inclusi laborabant, magno miraculo in omnibus verbis et sententiis inter se consensisse. Sed hanc fabulam nec in prima Apologia, ubi agit de Septuaginta Interpretibus, commemorat, nec in Dialogo illius credendæ onus imponit Judæis: in quo quidem non levis conjectura est eam Justinum aut missam fecisse, aut saltem suspectam habere cœpisse.* Some will rather conjecture from this, that Justin was not the author of the *Cohortatio*; and I could name a friend, well known to the learned world, and a very good judge, who thinks that nothing of Justin is certainly genuine, besides the *Dialogue* and the *Apologies*. The Benedictine endeavours to prove that the *Cohortatio* is to be ascribed to him, and contends with Casimir Oudin, who held the contrary opinion.²

⁸ The interpretation preferred by Justin is very doubtful; but see below, p. 182. Still τρίβου is clearly the true reading.—EDIT.

⁹ Apol. i. cc. 20, 44. Justin attributes the prohibition to peruse the books of the Sibyls, as well as those of the Prophets, to the instigation of dæmons, with the view of keeping Christians from the knowledge of the truth. See Casaubon's Exercitt. ad Baron. Annal. i. 11, cited by Bishop Kaye.—EDIT. ¹ P. 604.

² Præf. p. lxxviii. [There seems indeed to be little doubt that the *Exhortation to the Greeks* has been improperly attributed to Justin. The Bishop of Lincoln has gone minutely into the question; and the points of discrepancy which he has detected between the signification of certain words, as employed in this treatise and in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, and in the accounts of the divine manifestation to Moses in

The Sibyl in the Proem says,

Τίς γὰρ σὰρξ δύναται τὸν ἐπουράνιον καὶ ἀληθῆ
 Ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδεῖν Θεὸν ἄμβροτον, ὅς πόλον οἰκεῖ ;
 Ἄλλ' οὐδ' ἀκτίνων κατεναντίον ἡελίοιο
 Ἄνθρωποι στῆναι δυνατοί, θνητοὶ γεγαῶτες.

Socrates, in Xenophon, has the same sentiment, and says that the Deity is inconspicuous, and that a man cannot look upon the sun without being dazzled.³ Theophilus, Minucius Felix, Theodoret, and others have said the same thing. Clemens Alexandrinus fancied that Xenophon borrowed it from the sybil.⁴ But even admitting the antiquity of these verses, and supposing that they were written in Noah's Ark, it will not follow from the parity of thought, that Socrates or Xenophon had seen them; since all men, except those who are blind, know, without an instructor, that it is impossible to look upon the sun when he shines out in full strength. One thing is very plain, that the two first verses, and the word *σὰρξ*, for *mortal man*, are taken from the Scriptures.

Justin⁵ has cited a very singular passage from Sophocles:—

Εἷς ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν, εἷς ἐστὶν Θεὸς,
 Ὃς οὐρανὸν τέτευχε, καὶ γαῖαν μακρὰν,
 Πόντου τε χαροπὸν οἶδμα, κἀνέμων βίαις.
 Θνητοὶ δὲ πολλοὶ, καρδίᾳ πλανώμενοι,
 Ἰδρυσάμεσθα πημάτων παραψυχὴν
 Θεῶν ἀγάλματ' ἐκ λίθων τε καὶ ξύλων,
 Ἡ χρυσοτεύκτων ἢ ἐλεφαντίνων τύπους·
 Θυσίας τε τούτοις καὶ καλὰς πανηγύρεις
 Τεύχοντες, οὕτως εὖσεβεῖν νομίζομεν.

In the seventh verse, should it be, Ἡ χρυσοτεύκτους ἢ ἐλεφαντίνους τύπους? Or ἢ ἑλεφαντίνους?

These verses are also to be found in Clemens Alexandrinus and

the bush, of the origin of idolatry, and of the Septuagint version of the Hebrew Scriptures, as related here and by Justin elsewhere, afford strong presumptive, if not conclusive, evidence of spuriousness. Dupin and others have noticed an apparent difference of style, from that of the acknowledged writings of Justin, which led them to draw the same conclusion with the learned prelate. It may be observed also, that Jerome speaks of a discussion respecting dæmons, originally included in the *Cohortatio*, and a citation from it exists in Leontius Byzantinus; neither of which can now be verified. If genuine, therefore, it is at least imperfect.—EDIT.]

³ Xen. Mem. iv. 3.

⁴ Cohort. p. 61, and Strom. v. 714.

⁵ Cohort. c. 18.

in other fathers, and with some variety of readings.⁶ *Though this extract be such, says Cudworth, as might well become a Christian, and be no where now to be found in those extant tragedies of this poet, many whereof have been lost ; yet the sincerity thereof cannot reasonably be at all suspected by us, it having been cited by so many of the ancient fathers in their writings against the Pagans ; as particularly Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Cyril, and Theodoret, of which number Clemens tells us, that it was attested likewise by that ancient Pagan historiographer, Hecataeus.*⁷

Hecataeus, whom Josephus commends,⁸ is said to have lived in the time of Alexander the Great, and to have conversed much with the Jews ; and he might have been a kind of proselyte, or half-Jew. Le Clerc suspects that this book of Hecataeus might have been forged by the Jews.⁹ Athenagoras only cites the two first verses of this fragment : it is strange that he should not have produced the rest, if he ever saw it, which made so much for his purpose. Some may think it improbable that Sophocles should venture to attack the gods and the religious ceremonies of his own country in so open a manner : but these verses are

⁶ See Euseb. P. Ev. xiii. 13, p. 680, and the notes of Vigerus. Bentley, in his Epistle to Mill, corrects these verses ascribed to Sophocles, and rejects them as spurious. [See Dyce's edition of Bentley's Works, vol. ii. pp. 256-258, 357-359.] One who should be disposed to dispute the point with Bentley, might say that, besides the first and illustrious Sophocles, there was a Sophocles his grandson, and a third in the time of the Ptolemies, and that they were all dramatic poets ; and he might suppose that this fragment, or a part of it, was possibly taken from the second or third Sophocles. See Fabricius B. Gr. i. 623. He might compound the matter, and conjecture that the three first lines were genuine, and the six following spurious. If the *Cohortatio* was not written by Justin, Athenagoras was perhaps the first father who took notice of this passage, and he only cites the two first verses ; which gives some reason to suspect that he never saw the rest. But, upon a review of the whole, I must agree with Bentley, and reject this *pious fragment* as the work of one forger, or perhaps of two. In the first verse, *Εἰς ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν εἰς ἐστὶν θεὸς* is preferable to *Ἐν ταῖς ἀληθείαισιν*. Bentley objects to *Θνητοὶ δὲ πουλυκερδεῖα πλανώμενοι*, that the fourth foot will be a spondee : but may not the diphthongs *αι, ει, οι*, be made short, when a vowel or diphthong follows in the same word ? Soph. *Philoct.* 1450. *Τίνα προσωφέλησιν ἔρξεις ; Βέλεσι τοῖς Ἡρακλείοις*. And so in other places, if I remember right. Hom. *Il.* Σ. 105. *Τοῖος ἔων, οἷος οὔτις Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων*. He observes, as I think, rightly, that an Attic writer would not use *πουλυκερδεῖα* in an iambic verse ; but *πουλὺς*, for *πολὺς*, is rather a poetic license than an Ionic dialect. The best objection to *πουλυκερδεῖα* is, that it is nonsense. Attic writers use the words *ὀλοῖατο, ὀψοῖατο, τιθέασι, διδόασι*, &c. which seem properly to belong to the Ionic dialect.

⁷ Intell. Syst. p. 363.

⁸ Contr. Apion. i. 22.

⁹ Bibl. Chois. viii. 392.

not, like those of the Sybil, in the style of the Scriptures, and it is certain that in the Greek comedies and tragedies there are many bold strokes against the fabulous and popular religions; and Clemens Alexandrinus¹ produces passages out of Euripides, Plato, and Zeno, which are very remote from the vulgar notions concerning the gods. The Fathers have taken great pains to collect such testimonies, for which we are much obliged to them.

Justin² cites an oracle, which seems to be a Jewish or a Christian trifle, which speaks of God as—*πρῶτον πλάσας μερόπων*, *Ἀδὰμ δὲ καλέσας*.

Justin, in the book *de Monarchia*, if it be his, produces a passage from *Philemon*, which others ascribe to *Menander*, wherein are these lines:—

Δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα χρήσιμον καθεστάναι,
Μὴ παρθένους φθείροντα, καὶ μοιχώμενον,
Κλέπτοντα, καὶ σφάζοντα χρημάτων χάριν,
[Τάλλότρια βλέποντα, κάπιθυμοῦντα
Ἦτοι γυναικὸς, πολυτελοῦς ἢ δώματος,
Ἡ κτήσεως, παιδὸς τε, παιδίσκης θ' ἀπλῶς,
Ἴππων, βοῶν τὸ σύνολον, ἢ κτηνῶν τί δὴ ;]
Μηδὲ βελόνης ἐν ἄμμ' ἐπιθυμῆς, Πάμφιλε.

The verses which I have inclosed in brackets are not in Clemens Alexandrinus,³ nor in Eusebius,⁴ nor in the collections of Grotius, or of Le Clerc. They are, I think, the handy-work of some Jew, or Christian, and a sorry imitation of the tenth commandment;⁵ and, it may be, an interpolation in Justin. *Τάλλότρια βλέποντα, κάπιθυμοῦντα* is not a verse, nor worth the mending. One might read, *Τάλλότρια βλέποντ', ἢ ἐπιθυμούμενον*.

He also cites some verses from *Æschylus*:—

Χώριζε θνητῶν τὸν Θεόν, καὶ μὴ δόκει
Ὅμοιον σαυτῷ σάρκινον καθεστάναι.—
Πάντα δύναται γάρ· δόξα δ' ὑψίστου Θεοῦ.

This passage is also to be found with some various readings in Clemens.⁶ The last line has an air of forgery; it is unharmonious, and prosaic, and seems to be taken from the Scriptures. In the second line, instead of *Ὅμοιον σαυτῷ*, it should

¹ Strom. v. p. 691. ² Cohort. c. 38. ³ Strom. v. 720. ⁴ Præp. Evang. xiii. 13.

⁵ Exod. xx. 47. Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου· οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ πλησίον σου, οὐδὲ τὸν ἀγρὸν αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ τὴν παιδίσκην αὐτοῦ, οὔτε τοῦ βοῦς αὐτοῦ, οὔτε τοῦ ὑπόζυγιου αὐτοῦ, οὔτε παντὸς κτήνους αὐτοῦ, οὔτε ὅσα τῷ πλησίον του ἐστί.

⁶ Strom. v. 727.

perhaps be Ὅμοια παντῶ—for the second foot will not regularly admit a spondee.

Eusebius, unless my memory deceives me, has made no direct use of the Sibyl; whence it may be conjectured that he had no great esteem for her. Dr. Middleton⁷ has charged him with approving, and justifying, a very silly acrostic of the Erythræan Sibyl. The father of Ecclesiastical history deserves not this censure; and the doctor has inadvertently ascribed to Eusebius sentiments contained in an Oration, published indeed by Eusebius, but composed by the Emperor Constantine. As to the emperor's judgment, defend it who will, for I will not: but why should Eusebius be responsible for the mistakes of Constantine?⁸

Eusebius cites the Sibyl;⁹ but in the words of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, whom he transcribes. He produces a passage from her concerning the tower of Babel;¹ but he took it, as he informs us, from Josephus,² who says, Περὶ δὲ τοῦ πύργου τούτου καὶ τῆς ἀλλοφωνίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων μέμνηται καὶ Σίβυλλα, λέγουσα οὕτως, Πάντων ὁμοφώνων ὄντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πύργον ᾠκοδόμησάν τινες ὑψηλότατον, ὥς ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβησόμενοι δι' αὐτοῦ· οἱ δὲ θεοὶ ἀνέμους ἐπιπέμψαντες ἀνέτρεψαν τὸν πύργον, καὶ ἰδίαν ἐκάστῳ φωνὴν ἔδωκαν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Βαβυλῶνα συνέβη κληθῆναι τὴν πόλιν. The verses relating to this subject are preserved by *Theophilus*.³

Ἄλλ' ὁπότεν μεγάλοιο θεοῦ τελέωνται ἀπειλαί,
 Ἄς ποτ' ἐπηπείλησε βροτοῖς, ὅτε πύργον ἔτευξαν
 Χώρῃ ἐν Ἀσσυρίῃ, ὁμόφωνοι δ' ἦσαν ἅπαντες,
 Καὶ βούλοντ' ἀναβῆν' εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα·
 Αὐτίκα δ' ἀθάνατος μεγάλην ἐπέθηκεν ἀνάγκην
 Πνεύμασιν. Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἀνεμοὶ μέγαν ὑψόθι πύργον
 ῥίψαν, καὶ θνητοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι ἔριν ᾤρσαν.
 Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πύργος τ' ἔπεσεν, γλῶσσαι τ' ἀνθρώπων
 Εἰς πολλὰς θνητῶν ἐμερίσθησαν διαλέκτους,
 Γαῖα βροτῶν πληροῦτο μερίζομένων βασιλῶν.

In the last line perhaps for βασιλῶν it should be βασιλειῶν.

⁷ Eusebius has preserved an acrostic. He tells us, however, that many people rejected it; but the truth, adds he, is manifest: for it is agreed by all that Cicero had read this poem. Now the sole ground of this confident assertion is, &c. Inquiry, p. 36.

⁸ See Constantini Orat. apud Eusebium, (p. 700. Edit. Cant.) and Valesius there; and Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 32.

⁹ Præp. Evang. xiii. 13.

¹ Ibid. ix. 15.

² Ant. i. 4.

³ Ad Autolyceum, ii. 31.

The earth was replenished with men, and divided into various kingdoms.

Hence it may be concluded that a Sibylline Oracle concerning the Tower of Babel was extant in the days of Josephus; and hence Beveridge makes some inferences in favour of the Sibylline verses cited by the ancient Fathers, which are by no means conclusive and satisfactory.⁴

Was the Oracle mentioned by Josephus in prose or in verse? We cannot certainly tell, but it is most probable that it was in verse, and that Josephus gave us the sense and substance of it in prose. Had Josephus those verses before him which are preserved by Theophilus? Beveridge says he had, and so thinks Isaac Vossius; and it may be so. But then the verses seem to have undergone some alteration afterwards; for the Sibyl in Josephus says that from the confusion of languages the place was called *Babylon*; the Sibyl in Theophilus says it not: the Sibyl in Josephus says that οἱ θεοὶ, *the gods*, overthrew the edifice; but in the verses it is Ἀθάνατος, *God*, which may seem better to agree with μέγαλοιο θεοῦ that went before. One might conjecture that at first it was thus:—

Αὐτίκα δ' ΑΘΑΝΑΤΟΙ μεγάλην ΕΠΕΘΗΚΑΝ ἀνάγκην
Πνεύμασιν· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἄνεμοι μέγαν ὑψόθι πύργον
ῥίψαν, καὶ θνητοῖσιν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι ἔριν ὤρσαν.

By this change, Ἀθάνατοι may be the nominative case to ὤρσαν, instead of ἄνεμοι, and it seems more reasonable that the *Gods*, than the *winds*, should set the men at variance. It is in a Pagan style, and yet a Jewish forger might write it, and take the bold liberty to say Ἀθάνατοι, meaning *God* and his *angels*, or *the angels*. Angels are sometimes called *gods*; and in *Genesis*,⁵ whence this account is taken, *the Lord said, Let us go down, and there confound their language*;⁶—in which words, according to many of the Rabbins, God speaks to his angels. Josephus himself now and then uses expressions bordering upon Paganism.

It is not safe to trust one's memory in things of this kind; but I think that profane authors, though they sometimes say ἀθάνατοι, for *the gods*, and make it a substantive, yet never say

⁴ Cod. Can. Illustr. i. 14.

⁵ Gen. xi. 7.

⁶ In this, and similar expressions, there is, in fact, a reference to a *plurality*, i. e. a *Trinity* of persons in the Godhead.—EDIT.

Ἀθάνατος simply, for *God*, or the *supreme God*. The Sibylline Oracles more than once use this word in this manner, and show by it that they are not the work of a Pagan.

The supposition which some have made, that *Justin Martyr* was guilty of forging the Sibylline Oracles, is groundless and perverse. Justin has written his own character in every page of his works, and shows himself pious, warm, sprightly, fearless, open, hasty, honest, inquisitive, sincere, and as void of dissimulation and hypocrisy as a child. Add to this, that he writes like a man who had no turn for such things, and was not only no poet, but not a verse-maker. But though he was incapable of forgery, he was deluded by these forged Oracles, and perhaps by his authority led the Fathers who lived after him into the same error.

Tatian makes no use of the Sibylline Oracles, and only just mentions the Sibyl amongst the writers who were before Homer, and after Moses.⁸ *Athenagoras*, to show that the gods of the Gentiles were men, produces six verses from the Sibyl.⁹ *Theophilus* gives us no less than eighty-four Sibylline verses, the same which stand in the beginning of the editions of these oracles, and which are mere patch-work of Scripture-phrase. When the Greek poets said things consonant to the Holy Scriptures, Theophilus observes that they stole their knowledge from the Law and the Prophets:—κλέψαντες ταῦτα ἐκ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν.¹ It is strange that he did not suspect the same thing of the Sibyl, whose thefts are so open and glaring.

The Sibylline verses cited by the Fathers, and those which are preserved in our present collection, are often the same, and always of the same stamp and value, and liable to the same objections. It is a vain thing to receive the one, and reject the other. It is better to defend them all heroically in the lump, and not to do the work by halves, nor make a distinction where there is no difference.

Clemens Alexandrinus was learned, and willing to show his learning, and to let the world see that he had perused all sorts of authors; and therefore could not possibly omit the Sibyl.²

⁸ Orat. contr. Græc. c. 41.

⁹ Legat. c. 30.

¹ Ad Autol. ii. 37.

² Clement (*Cohort.* xxiv. 1) calls the Sibyl ἡ προφητικὴ καὶ ποιητικὴ Σίβυλλα. Indeed he generally attributes to her the gift of prophecy. Compare Strom. v. 514. 23.—EDIT.

He produces these verses from the Sibyl, though he names her not, in praise of the Hebrews.⁴

Οἵτινες οὐκ ἀπάτησι κεναῖς οὐδ' ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων
Χρύσεα καὶ χάλκεια, καὶ ἀργύρου, ἥδ' ἐλέφαντος,
Καὶ ξυλίνων λιθίνων τε, βροτῶν εἶδωλα θανόντων,
Τιμῶσιν, ὅσαπέρ τε βροτοὶ, κενεόφρονι βουλῇ·
'Αλλὰ γὰρ αἴρουσιν πρὸς οὐρανὸν ὠλένας ἀγνάς
'Ορθριοὶ ἐξ εὐνῆς, αἰεὶ χροᾶ ἀγνίζοντες
'Υδασι, καὶ τιμῶσι μόνον τὸν αἰὲ μεδέοντα
'Αθάνατον.

The fifth verse seems to be taken from St. Paul.⁵ Perhaps πρὸς γ' οὐρανὸν, for the sake of metre, and also ὠλένας ἀγνοῦς, from ὠλήν; for the last syllable of ὠλένας, from ὠλένη, is long. In the last verse for 'Αθάνατον, Sylburgius would read 'Αθανάτων. I know not why.⁶

Amongst the Sibylline verses cited by *Theophilus* and *Clemens*, are these:—

Εἷς Θεὸς ἐστι, βροχὰς, ἀνέμους, σεισμοὺς ἐπιπέμπων,
'Αστεροπὰς, λιμοὺς, λοιμοὺς, καὶ κήδεα λυγρὰ,
Καὶ νιφετοὺς, κρύσταλλα· τί δὴ καθ' ἐν ἐξαγορεύω;

This is taken from the *Psalms*:—Τοῦ διδόντος χίωνα—βάλλοντος κρύσταλλον αὐτοῦ—χάλαζα, χιῶν, κρύσταλλος, πνεῦμα καταιγίδος.⁷

Minucius Felix mentions not the Sibyl, though he was invited to it by his subject, where he defends the Christians for teaching the doctrine of a conflagration and a future judgment, and appeals to the poets and philosophers, who had said the same thing.⁸ I am glad of it, for the sake of that ingenious and agreeable author.

The Phrygian Sibyl is said to have been called *Diana*, Ἄρτεμις, and to have uttered these verses at Delphi:—

Ἦ Δελφοὶ, θεράποντες ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος,
Ἦλθον ἐγὼ χρήσουσα Διὸς νόον αἰγιόχοιο,
Αὐτοκασιγνήτῃ κεχολωμένη Ἀπόλλωνι.

Thus *Clemens*.⁹ And *Pausanias* also says that the Sibyl calls herself *Herophile*, and *Diana*; and the sister, and sometimes the wife, and sometimes the daughter of Apollo.¹ We have here, I think, the fragment of a true old Sibylline oracle made

⁴ Cohort. p. 60.

⁵ 1 Tim. ii. 8. ἐπαίροντας ὁσίοις χεῖρας.

⁶ This passage may be found in the Sibyll. Or. iii.

⁷ Ps. cxlvii. cxlviii.

⁸ Octav. cc. 34, &c.

⁹ Strom. i. p. 384.

¹ See the notes.

by a Pagan. It looks as if it were composed by some priest, who had a mind to set up an oracle in opposition to the Delphic, and to draw the trade to another shop.

*Pausanias*² gives us this Sibylline oracle predicting a defeat of the Athenians, and made, I suppose, after the event :—

Καὶ τότε Ἀθηναίοισι βαρύστονα κήδεα θήσει
 Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, οὐπερ κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον.
 Νηυσὶ φέρει πολέμοιο μάχην καὶ δηϊοτήτα
 Ὀλλυμέναις δολεροῖσι τρόποις, κακότητι νομῶν.

Dio, or *Xiphiline*,³ mentions a verse, pretended to be a Sibylline oracle, concerning Nero, which was handed about when Nero⁴ had burnt the city of Rome ; and which, to be sure, was composed after he had killed his mother :—Ἐσχατος Αἰνεαδῶν μητροκτόνος ἡγεμονεύσει. But, says the historian, it was really fulfilled. Indeed ! As if it required divination, to foresee that such a debauched, miserable, odious wretch as Nero would in all probability die without heirs, or be cut off by some conspiracy, and that with him the Julian family would be extinguished ! Nero married Sporus, upon which one of the wits of those days observed, that it had been well for mankind, *Si pater ejus Domitius talem duxisset uxorem*.

I shall conclude this poetical section with an oracle from the *Anthologia*, and as good an oracle as the Sibyl ever uttered :—

Πρὸς τὸν μάντιν Ὀλυμπον Ὀνήσιμος ἦλθ' ὁ παλαιστής,
 Καὶ πένταθλος Ὑλᾶς, καὶ σταδιεὺς Μενεκλῆς,
 Τίς μέλλει νικᾶν αὐτῶν τὸν ἀγῶνα, θέλοντες
 Γινῶναι κακείνος τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐνιδῶν,
 Πάντες, ἔφη, νικᾶτε, μόνον μή τις σὲ παρέλθῃ,
 Καὶ σὲ καταστρέψῃ, καὶ σὲ παρατροχάσῃ.

Thus imitated by Ausonius :

Doctus Hylas cæstu, Phegeus catus arte palæstræ,
 Clarus Olympiacis et Lycus in stadiis,
 An possent omnes venturo vincere agone,
 Hammonem Libyæ consulere deum.

² In Phoc.

³ Xiphilin. p. 180. ed. Steph. Ἐτερον λόγιον, ὡς καὶ Σιβύλλειον οὕτως ὄν, ἦδον ἔστι δὲ
 Ἐσχατος — [τοῦτο,

Καὶ ἔσχευ οὕτως, εἴ τε καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς θεομαντεία τινὶ προλεχθὲν, εἴτε καὶ τότε ὑπὸ τοῦ
 δμίλου πρὸς τὰ παρόντα θειασθέν. Τελευταῖος γὰρ τῶν Ἰουλίων τῶν ἀπὸ Αἰνείου γενο-
 μένων ἐμονάρχησε.

⁴ Nero killed his mother, A.D. 59 ; and burnt the city, A.D. 64.

Sed deus, ut sapiens, Dabitur victoria vobis
 Indubitata quidem, si caveatis, ait,
 Ne quis Hylam cæstu, ne quis certamine luctæ
 Phegea, ne cursu te, Lyce, prætereat.

XII.—ON THE APOSTOLICAL FATHERS.

1. THERE is an *Epistle* ascribed to BARNABAS: we cannot certainly know by whom it was written. The first who cites it is Clemens Alexandrinus, who was born about the middle of the second century; and there is a passage in it, which shows that it was written after the destruction of Jerusalem. We may therefore conclude that it was composed after A.D. 70, and before 180, and probably in the first century. He says of the Temple:—
 Διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολεμεῖν αὐτοὺς, καθηρέθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν νῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑπηρεταὶ ἀνοικοδομήσουσιν (ἀνοικοδομοῦσιν) αὐτόν.⁵
 He mentions not this destruction, as an event which had just then come to pass, but says indefinitely καθηρέθη, as if some time at least were elapsed since that calamity. There is a great conformity between the subject of this epistle and of that to the Hebrews; but a great difference between the epistles, for that to the Hebrews is in all respects superior.

Since the author of this Epistle, as it now stands, discovers not himself, and gives no internal mark by which we may find him out; and since the name of *Barnabas* might be common to other persons, or assumed on purpose; one would willingly take occasion from hence to ascribe it to some unknown author, rather than to the Apostle Barnabas. If it was really the work of St. Paul's companion, there are internal characters in it, which should incline us to judge that he was not at that time under any particular guidance of the Holy Spirit. The ancient Christians judged so, and received it not as a canonical book; which shows also that they were not so very credulous, and so ready to adopt everything, as they are imagined by some to have been.⁶

⁵ Barn. Ep. c. 16.

⁶ Whether the Epistle, which has been ascribed to *Barnabas*, was really written by the apostle of that name, may fairly be doubted; though it has never been satisfactorily proved to be a forgery. The testimony of antiquity is greatly in favour of its genuineness. Not only is it expressly ascribed to the apostle *Barnabas* by Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* ii, 6), but Origen (*c. Cels.* i. 24) refers to it under the title of the *Catholic Epistle of Barnabas*. Eusebius in one place (*H. E.* vi. 14) places it among

Barnabas is supposed by Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, and many of the ancients, to have been one of the seventy disciples;⁷ and when he is first mentioned in the *Acts*, nothing is said to intimate that he was converted after Christ's ascension.⁸ When

the canonical Scriptures, in connection with the "Epistle of Jude and the other Catholic epistles;" though in another place (iii. 25) he speaks of it as spurious. Jerome (Vir. Ill. c. 6) classes it with the *Apocryphal* Scriptures; claiming for it, at the same time, the authorship of Barnabas. On the other hand, there is no express testimony of the ancients, which assigns it to any other writer; nor are the internal arguments alleged against it sufficient of themselves to prove it spurious. In modern times, Pearson, Cave, Du Pin, Hammond, Voss, Bull, Wake, and Lardner, contend strongly for its genuineness; while its claims have been rejected, with more or less hesitation, by Cotelierius and Mosheim, and, more recently, by Neander, Winer, and other German critics. With respect to the objection, that, if Barnabas were really the author, it would have been generally received as canonical; and that the fanciful and allegorical interpretations of Scripture, with which it abounds, could not have proceeded from one of the apostles; both of them rest upon the assumption that Barnabas must necessarily have written under the influence of inspiration. Such, however, is by no means the case; but, without entering upon a discussion on the point, it is sufficient to remark, that, whether genuine or not, the Epistle is unquestionably of very early date. Besides the passage cited by *Jortin*, there is another (c. 4) which refers to the destruction of Jerusalem; and a comparison of the two passages leads to the conclusion that the city had been recently destroyed. Hence Mill (*Proleg.* N. T. 144) fixes its date to the year 70, and Lardner to the year 71 or 72. Moreover, a perusal of the Epistle suggests the idea of an author who had himself conversed with the apostles, rather than of one who had merely read their works; though the design is nearly the same as that of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, and there are many passages similar in substance, rather than expression, to corresponding texts in the writings of that apostle. There is also a precept said to have been delivered by our blessed Lord, which is not to be found in any of the Gospels:—*Sicut dicit filius Dei, resistamus omni iniquitati, et odio habeamus eam.* This is clearly analogous to the saying in the Acts (xx. 35), and amounts to a fair presumption that the writer had either conversed with Christ himself, or had received the precept from some of his immediate followers. Upon the whole, from certain evident marks of interpolation, and a want of uniformity in the style, the Epistle seems to be the composition of some Hebrew Christian of the same name, founded perhaps upon one of Barnabas, rather than a genuine composition of the apostle himself. It is not now extant, *entire*, in the Greek; the first four chapters and part of the fifth being lost: but there is a Latin version, which has preserved the whole of it.—EDIT.

⁷ Tillemont. Hist. Eccl. i. 408.

⁸ Of the life of BARNABAS, little is known beyond what is related of him in the New Testament. We learn from the Acts (iv. 36) that he was a Levite, and a native of the island of Cyprus. His name was originally *Joses*, but changed by the apostles to *Barnabas*, which St. Luke interprets *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως*, *the son of consolation*. This change, it should seem, was an honourable testimony to the Christian fellowship and disinterested charity by which he was led to dispose of his estate, for

he preached with Paul, the Pagans of Lystra took him to be *Jupiter*, and Paul to be *Mercurius*:⁹ whence it might be conjectured that he looked, and that he was, much older than St. Paul ; but I dare not lay a stress on this argument. Chrysostom says that he was ἀπὸ τῆς ὀψέως ἀξιοπρεπῆς, that he had an air which commanded esteem and respect. I fancy that Chrysostom had the same conjecture in his mind, and thought that the Pagans were induced to take Barnabas for Jupiter, from his amiable aspect and majestic countenance, fit for the *father of gods and men*. Upon the whole, there may be room to suspect either that he did not survive the destruction of Jeru-

the support and consolation of the more necessitous brethren. Some indeed have supposed that the name was rather intended to denote the *son of exhortation*, and that it was given in allusion to the earnestness and eloquence of his preaching. Thus Chrysostom (Hom. xi. on the Acts) :—Βαρνάβας δοκεῖ μοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς εἰληφεῖν τὸ ὄνομα, ὡς πρὸς τοῦτο ἱκανὸς ὢν καὶ ἐπιτήδειος. That παράκλησις will admit of this interpretation is undoubtedly true ; but it is no less so, that the other, independently of St. Luke's sanction, is far more natural and appropriate. Bede, contrary to the opinion of Clement, maintains that the proffer of his goods first introduced him to the apostles ; and it has also been said, though upon what authority it does not appear, that he was brought up with St. Paul, at the feet of Gamaliel. The close companionship of the two apostles in the propagation of the Gospel, may give some colour to the notion of their early acquaintance. With their separation, caused by the unhappy dissension mentioned in the Acts, the Scripture history of Barnabas concludes ; and all beyond is unauthentic tradition and vague conjecture. There exists an old monkish legend, cited by Baronius, which contains some marvellous stories touching the invention of his relics, and the appearance of the saint himself to Anthemius, Bishop of Salamis, which led to their discovery. Upon the same authority we are told that he suffered martyrdom at Salamis, at the hands of certain Jews, who stoned him to death while disputing with them in a synagogue. Whatever credit may be due to this relation, it is more than probable that his labours, after parting with St. Paul, were chiefly confined to Cyprus, which was the residence of a considerable number of Jews. (See Dio Cass. lxxviii.) It has been said however, though with little credibility, that he travelled into Italy, and preached at Rome even before St. Peter ; and the foundation of the Church of Milan has been assigned to him. If he quitted Cyprus at all, Asia Minor or Egypt was the limit of his travels. There is a tradition that he consecrated his nephew, Mark, first bishop of Alexandria. Besides the *Epistle*, an *Apocryphal Gospel* has been attributed to Barnabas ; but the most cursory inspection is sufficient to detect the forgery. By some he has also been regarded as the author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. Tertullian (*de Pudicit.* c. 20) quotes him distinctly as the writer of it ; and Jerome leaves the claim to it unsettled between *Barnabas*, *Luke*, *Clement*, and *St. Paul*. The absence of the true author's name from the head of the *Epistle* is probably the sole origin of any doubts upon the subject.—EDIT.

⁹ Acts. xiv. 12.

salem, or that he was then very old, and *emeritus*, and not likely to write a long and laboured Epistle.

It has been said that Barnabas and Clemens Romanus speak not of miracles as being performed in the Church in their time. Suppose it to be true, the same thing might be observed of some Epistles in the New Testament, particularly of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which were written before the destruction of Jerusalem, when St. Paul and some other apostles were living, and preaching the Gospel in various places; *the Lord working with them, and, as we may justly suppose, confirming the word with signs following.*¹

Barnabas² says, ἐποίησε γὰρ πάντα ὄφιν δάκνειν αὐτοὺς, that is, *God caused all sorts of serpents to bite the people of Israel in the wilderness.* I have sometimes thought that it should be πυροέντα ὄφιν. Num. xxi. 6. *Misit Dominus in populum serpentes urentes, Seraphim; or ignitos, as Jerome renders it.* The LXX. indeed has θανατοῦντας. We translate it *fiery serpents.* Πυροέντα ὄφιν, in the singular, for *fiery serpents*, would by a Hebraism, as v. 7. *Ora ut tollat a nobis serpentem:* but the emendation is uncertain. Justin Martyr, speaking of the same thing, says, ἀπήντησαν αὐτοῖς ἰοβόλα θηρία, ἐχιδναὶ τε καὶ ἀσπίδες, καὶ ὀφείων πᾶν γένος, ὃ ἐθανάτου τὸν λαόν,³—which favours the received reading in Barnabas. One would almost think that Justin took his πᾶν γένος from Barnabas. Le Clerc thinks that he has found a remark in Justin's *Apology* borrowed from Barnabas.⁴ The Benedictine Editor of Justin is of the same opinion.⁵

Valentinus,⁶ who taught his heretical doctrines about A.D. 140, and might be born at the end of the first or the beginning of the second century, says: Εἰς δὲ ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς, οὗ παρρησία ἢ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ φανέρωσις· καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ μόνου δύναιτο ἂν ἡ καρδία καθαρὰ γενέσθαι, παντὸς πονηροῦ πνεύματος ἐξωθουμένου τῆς καρδίας. Πολλὰ γὰρ ἐνοικοῦντα αὐτῇ πνεύματα οὐκ ἐὰ καθαρεύειν· ἕκαστον δὲ αὐτῶν τὰ ἴδια ἐκτελεῖ ἔργα, πολλαχῶς ἐνυβριζόντων ἐπιθυμίαις οὐ προσηκούσαις. Καί μοι δοκεῖ ὁμοίον τι πάσχειν τῷ πανδοχείῳ ἡ καρδία· καὶ γὰρ

¹ Mark xvi. 20.

² Ch. 12.

³ Apol. i. c. 60.

⁴ Bibl. Chois. iii. 391.

⁵ Addend. p. 603.

⁶ Valentinus made his appearance, as a teacher, perhaps about A.D. 140. But see Massuet's dissertation concerning him in Irenæus, in which he places him somewhat earlier. [Of this heretic, and the *Gnostics* generally, see Burton's *Bampton Lectures*. —EDIT.]

ἐκεῖνο κατατιτράταί τε καὶ ὀρύττεται, καὶ πολλάκις κόπρου πίμπλαται, ἀνθρώπων ἀσελγῶς ἐμμενόντων, καὶ μηδεμίαν πρόνοιαν ποιουμένων τοῦ χωρίου, καθάπερ ἀλλοτρίου καθεστῶτος. Τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον καὶ ἡ καρδία, μέχρι μὴ προνοίας τυγχάνει, ἀκάθαρτος οὖσα, πολλῶν οὖσα δαιμόνων οἰκητήριον· ἐπειδὴν δὲ ἐπισκέψηται αὐτὴν ὁ μόνος ἀγαθὸς Πατὴρ, ἡγίασται, καὶ φωτὶ διαλάμπει· καὶ οὕτω μακαρίζεται ὁ ἔχων τὴν τοιαύτην καρδίαν, ὅτι ὄψεται τὸν Θεόν. This fragment is preserved by Clemens Alexandrinus,⁷ where he stands up for human liberty against the Valentinians, who were a sort of Fatalists or Predestinarians, and thought themselves to be the only elect. Observe that Valentinus bears witness to the authority of the New Testament, for he takes passages or expressions from it to insinuate and recommend his own doctrines; as υἱοῦ φανέρωσις, δαιμόνων οἰκητήριον, ἐπισκέψηται, μόνος ἀγαθὸς Πατὴρ, φωτὶ διαλάμπει, μακαρίζεται, ὄψεται Θεόν.⁸ He also seems upon the whole to imitate Barnabas, who says, Πρὸ τοῦ ἡμᾶς πιστεῦσαι τῷ Θεῷ, ἦν ἡμῶν τὸ οἰκητήριον τῆς καρδίας φθαρτὸν καὶ ἀσθενὲς, ὅτι ἦν πλήρης μὲν εἰδωλολατρείας, καὶ ἦν οἶκος δαιμόνων. Διὸ ἐν τῷ κατοικητηρίῳ ἡμῶν ἀληθῶς ὁ Θεός· κατοικεῖ ἐν ἡμῖν· πῶς; ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ τῆς πίστεως.

2. HERMAS⁹ is cited by Irenæus, who was born about A. D.

⁷ Strom. ii. p. 489.

⁸ See 1 Tim. iii. 16; Rev. xviii. 2; Luke vii. 16; Matt. xix. 17; Luke xi. 36; Matt. v. 8.

⁹ Among the persons to whom St. Paul addresses salutations at the close of his Epistle to the *Romans*, is HERMAS; who has generally been identified with the Apostolical Father of that name. This solitary record is all that occurs concerning him in the New Testament; and it is to the work which he has left behind him, if it be genuine, that we are indebted for the few particulars that are known of the life of its author. He seems to have possessed considerable wealth, which, before his conversion to Christianity, he dissipated in idle extravagancies (Vis. iii. 6); and it was long before his faith was sufficiently strong to enable him to persuade his wife and children to embrace the Gospel. His charities, however, gradually increased; and he applied himself at length in earnest, not only to the reformation of his own family, but to the general diffusion of Christianity, and to uphold the patience and perseverance of the infant Church in seasons of trial and persecution. Both the time and manner of his death are equally uncertain. The only work which goes under his name is entitled *The Shepherd*, from the circumstance that the angel, who is the principal actor in it, is represented in the pastoral habit and character. It is divided into three books, of which the first contains four *visions*; the second, twelve *commands*; and the last, ten *similitudes*. The Greek work is entirely lost, with the exception of a few fragments, which are chiefly important as proving that the Latin translation which we possess is a faithful transcript of the original. Of the intrinsic merit of

120. He is also observed to have made no mention of miracles; but he had nothing to lead him to it, and his book is taken up with visions and revelations. I offered a conjecture concerning it, that it was a *Parable*.²

He mentions a vision of a formidable beast threatening to devour him, from which he was preserved; and he interprets this of a great tribulation which was to come upon the Christians, and which some have applied to Domitian's persecution.³

3. CLEMENS ROMANUS⁴ is an author on whom I have elsewhere

the production itself the most widely different opinions have been entertained, both in ancient and modern times. While, on the one hand, it has been greeted with unqualified praise, and even read in churches as part of the Canon, it has been equally decried, on the other, as childish and profane. Among the moderns, Pearson, Bull, Cotelerius, Wake, and Lardner, are powerful advocates in its favour; Daillé, Mosheim, and Scultetus, reject it with the most sweeping censure. With respect to its *genuineness*, it is quoted, with great respect, by Irenæus (ap Euseb. H. E. iv. 8); Clemens Alexandrinus makes frequent citations from it (Strom. i. pp. 311, 356; ii. pp. 360, 379; and elsewhere); Origen leans, though doubtingly, to the notion of its inspiration (Comm. Ep. Rom. p. 411); Jerome (Cat. Script.) speaks of it as a profitable book, though apochryphal (Comm. in Habb. i. 14); Tertullian, before his lapse into Montanism, entertained great respect for it (de Orat. 12), though he afterwards rejected it with contempt; Eusebius (H. E. iii. 3), while he rejects it from the Canon, states that it was read in churches, as useful to edification; and almost all these authorities are unanimous in ascribing it to Hermas, who is mentioned by St. Paul. As to the visionary character of the book, it is doubtless indicative of the peculiar bent of the writer's temper, but in no way detracts either from the orthodoxy of his sentiments, or the sincerity of his heart. As a means of ascertaining the date of the *Shepherd*, it appears from the conclusion of the second Vision, that it was written when Clement was Bishop of Rome; so that Jortin is clearly correct in supposing that the persecution under Domitian was then impending. The "wild beasts, the scourgings, the imprisonments, and crucifixions," to which the Christians had already been exposed, agree so well with their sufferings under Nero, that those horrors may fairly be inferred to have passed away; and the most probable date of the work seems to be that of Tillemont, who supposes it to have been written about the year 92. Some, indeed, understand the aforesaid trials of the destruction of Jerusalem; but a statement that all the apostles were now dead (Sim. ix. 16) is altogether at variance with such an hypothesis.—EDIT.

² Disc. vi. on the Christ. Rel.

³ L. i. Vis. ii. § 2, 3, p. 77; Vis. iv. p. 82.

⁴ CLEMENT, some time Bishop of Rome, is generally supposed to have been the same person whom St. Paul mentions as one of his *fellow-labourers*, whose name is written in the book of life (Phil. iv. 3). See Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iii. 12; Epiphan. adv. Carpocr. i. 6; Jerom. Comm. l. c. Tradition is not altogether silent respecting Clement; but the few particulars which are related of him do not rest on very credible authority. Irenæus, however, states distinctly (Hær. iii. 3), that "he had seen and conversed with the blessed apostles, and had their preaching sounding in

made some remarks.⁵ I have only this to add:—Clemens⁶ says, *Διὰ ζῆλον ὁ πατὴρ ἩΜΩΝ Ἰακώβ ἀπέδρα*,—whence, I find, some

his ears, and their traditions before his eyes.” His father’s name was *Faustinus*; his mother’s *Mattidea*; and he was, in all probability, a native of Rome; though not, as some have ventured to affirm, a descendant of the imperial family. This mistake seems to have originated with some, who confounded him with the consul *Flavius Clemens*, a cousin of the Emperor Domitian, whom he put to death for refusing to sacrifice to the heathen gods. When a young man, he is said to have prosecuted his studies at Athens; and it was there perhaps that he sought, in the schools of the philosophers, for a solution of his doubts respecting the immortality of the soul. On this important point he was at length satisfied by Barnabas, whom he casually met with St. Peter at Cæsarea, and, by the united efforts of the two apostles, his conversion to Christianity was brought about. From this period he probably maintained a constant intercourse, not only with St. Peter, but with St. Paul also, when at Rome; and acted under their guidance in promoting the welfare of the Christian community in the imperial city. In the mean time, the persecution under Nero broke out, during the progress of which his inspired instructors suffered, it is said, on the same day. By what means Clement himself escaped a similar fate is uncertain; but he was preserved by an all-wise Providence, to superintend the reviving interests of the Church, as bishop of the Roman see.

With respect to the date of this important appointment, there is considerable diversity of opinion. Irenæus (*ubi supra*), and Eusebius (H. E. iii. 13, 15, 22), make Clement the third in succession at Rome after the apostles; *Linus* and *Anencletus* having previously occupied the episcopal chair. To the same effect is the concurrent testimony of the whole Greek church; relying upon which, Du Pin, Tillemont, and Lardner, place his accession to the bishopric between the years 91 and 100 of the Christian era. On the other hand, most of the Latin fathers, with the exception of Jerome (*Vir. Ill.* 15), who follows Eusebius, adopt the statements of Tertullian (*de Præscr.* c. 32), that Clement was consecrated by St. Peter; and upon their authority, Pearson, Dodwell, and others, antedate his Episcopate to the destruction of Jerusalem. In order to reconcile both opinions, Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxvii. 6) conjectures that, although he was so consecrated, he declined to exercise the office till after the death of Linus and Anencletus. It is far more probable that *Linus*, who is mentioned by St. Paul (2 Tim. iv. 21), was consecrated bishop over the Jewish converts at Rome, being succeeded at his death (A.D. 79) by Anencletus; and that after the death of Anencletus (A.D. 92), when the inveterate prejudices of Jew against Gentile had considerably abated, Clement, having been already appointed by Peter to the Gentile charge, united both Jews and Gentiles under his single superintendence.

During Clement’s episcopate, records were kept of all those who suffered martyrdom within his district; and missionaries were sent to carry the gospel where it had not yet been preached. What other means he adopted for the well-being of the Church, cannot now be ascertained; but that he was not backward in providing for the peculiar exigencies of the times is evident from the Epistle which he wrote, in the name of the Church of Rome, to the Church of Corinth. The errors and differences by which that Church had formerly been divided, yielded for a time to the advice of St. Paul; but his death was the signal for renewed divisions, which

⁵ Disc. vi. p. 223, 3d edit.

⁶ Epist. i. 4.

persons have lately discovered and concluded that Clemens was a Jew. I think the passage will not prove it. Theophilus *ad*

bore so close a resemblance to those of former days, that we are not surprised to find occasional references in Clement's letter to those of the Apostle, and a great similarity in the precepts which they have respectively delivered. The style of Clement is simple and easy ; and he writes in a tone of mild, yet persuasive exhortation, occasionally breaking forth into a strain of holy eloquence and devout admiration of the goodness of God. Of the genuineness of the Epistle there can be no reasonable doubt, from the frequent and honourable mention that is made of it in the early Christian writings, and from its possession of all those *internal* marks, by which any work of antiquity is proved to belong to the author whose name it bears. Its subject corresponds with the occasion upon which Clement is known to have addressed the Corinthians : the citations from it, which are preserved in the works of subsequent writers, are found in it ; nor have any references been made to it which cannot be verified : it contains nothing, whatever Photius and others may have objected, which is unworthy of the author to whom it is assigned ; and it was unquestionably the production of the age in which it is said to have been written. Some have inferred from an observation of the writer (c. 41), that the Levitical sacrifices "*are*" not offered only in Jerusalem, that the Temple was still standing ; and consequently refer the calamities, alleged in excuse for the delay which had occurred in replying to the letter from Corinth, to the persecution under Nero. Hence they date the Epistle between A.D. 64 and 70. Now Josephus has a passage precisely similar to the above (Ant. iii. 9. 1), where the reference is avowedly subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem ; so that nothing more seems to be meant, than that such had been the appointment of the Law of Moses. It appears, moreover, from the 44th chapter of the Epistle, that all the Apostles were then dead ; and in c. 47, the church of Corinth is called *an ancient Church*. These expressions are clearly more suitable to the time of *Domitian* than of *Nero* ; and, as the letter was unquestionably written shortly after a period of persecution, its most probable date is the year 96. Of this date, which is that of Tillemont, Lardner, and Cotelierius, it is a strong confirmation that Irenæus and those other Fathers, who make Clement the successor of Anencletus, agree in assigning the Epistle to the time of his episcopate.

It was not till the year 1632 that the Epistle of Clement was known to be still in existence. In the reign of Charles the First, it was discovered at the end of a MS. of the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, presented to that monarch by Cyril, Patriarch of Constantinople ; and it was published in the following year, with notes and a Latin translation, by Patrick Young, the King's Librarian, at Oxford. Appended to it, there was also discovered the fragment of a second Epistle, or, as some think, of a discourse or sermon, which has been sometimes attributed to the same author. There seems, however, to be little doubt of its spuriousness. It is not mentioned by any writer earlier than Eusebius ; and Jerome (Cat. c. 15) asserts distinctly its rejection by antiquity.

Eusebius relates that Clement died in the third year of Trajan (A.D. 100), and in the ninth of his episcopate. The silence of this historian, as well as of Irenæus, on the subject of his martyrdom, may be regarded as decisive against the fabulous stories respecting his condemnation to the mines, and the miracle performed near

Autol. iii. 23, τὰ γράμματα τοῦ θεοῦ νόμον, τοῦ διὰ Μωσέως ἡμῖν δεδομένον. The Law was given to *us*, says Theophilus; and yet he had been converted from Paganism to Christianity. Therefore when any ancient Christian writers use such expressions, it is not to be inferred thence, with any kind of certainty, that they were of Jewish extraction, or even that they had been proselytes to Judaism. Indeed nothing is more natural than for Christians to speak as if they were Abraham's children; as if the Law and the Prophets and the Patriarchs belonged to them as well as to the Jews. In the same book Theophilus says, (c. 24.) Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατριάρχης ἡμῶν. 27. Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ προπάτορος ἡμῶν. 94. Δαυὶδ ὁ πρόγονος ἡμῶν.

The *Recognitions* and the *Homilies* attributed to CLEMENS, and written, as it is thought, in the second century, contain as much truth as Lucian's *True History*, *Aristeas*, *Gulliver's Travels*, the *Lives* of several Monks, of *Lazarillo*, of *David Simple*, and of *Gil Blas*. It would not be a reasonable request to desire any man to confute this work. It is sufficient to refer the reader to the judgment of Cotelierius.⁷ I shall only produce one passage, and none of the worst, for a specimen. Peter is introduced saying, *Quod cum vidisset Gamaliel princeps populi, qui latenter frater noster erat in fide, sed consilio nostro inter eos erat.*⁸ Here this knave of a forger makes Peter, or *Lord Peter*, as he commonly calls him, and the rest of the apostles mere politicians, who persuade Gamaliel to dissemble his religion, and to act the part of a spy and a hypocrite.

In the *Recognitions*,⁹ Simon Magus is introduced speaking thus:—*Pueri incorrupti et violenter necati animam adjuramentis ineffabilibus evocatam adsistere mihi feci, et per ipsam fit omne quod jubeo.* Dr. Middleton thus translates it: *Simon Magus confessed to one of his companions, that he wrought all his amazing works, by the help of the soul of an healthy young boy, who had been violently put to death for that purpose, and then*

the spot where he was subsequently put to death by drowning. Possibly these traditions, which are of comparatively recent date, originated in the murder of Flavius Clemens, already noticed, by order of Domitian.—EDIT.

⁷ P. 607. [Mr. Belsham calls the Clementine Homilies *the production of an Unitarian*. "We may safely leave to the Unitarians," says Bishop Burgess, "all the credit of this ancient forgery, and medley of fables and absurdities."—EDIT.]

⁸ Hom. i. 65.

⁹ Recogn. ii. 13.

called up from the dead by ineffable adjurations, and compelled to be his assistant.¹

Pueri incorrupti animam. In the Greek it was, I suppose, παιδὸς ἀδιαφθόρου ψυχὴν. Justin Martyr calls such children ἀδιαφθόρους, and Socrates the historian ἀφθόρους παῖδας. Justin *Apol.* i. c. 18. Νεκρομαντεῖαι μὲν γὰρ, καὶ αἱ ἀδιαφθόρων παίδων ἐποπτεύσεις. Socrat. H. E. iii. 13. Καὶ τελετάς τινας συνίστασαν, ὥς καὶ σπλαγχνοσκοπούμενοι παῖδας καταθύειν ἀφθόρους, which Valesius translates: *Quin etiam nefanda quædam mysteria ab illis excogitata sunt; ita ut pueros impuberes immolarent, extaque eorum inspicerent.* I once told Dr. Middleton, that I was inclined to think that in this place *incorruptus* meant *impubes* rather than *sanus*. Ἀδιάφθορος, ἄφθορος, *incorruptus*, mean properly *impollutus*, *expers veneris*; and they are used for *impubes*, because children are usually *impolluti*. Thus παῖδα or κόρην διαφθείρειν is *stuprare*. Ἀφθορος, *impubes*, *impollutus*, *incorruptus*, *imberbis*; say the Lexica. Diosc. ii. c. 102, ἄφθορος παῖς, *puer imberbis*. Justin *Apol.* i. c. 15. Καὶ πολλοί τινες καὶ πολλαὶ, ἐξηκοντοῦται καὶ ἐβδομηκοντοῦται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένουσι. Here ἄφθοροι is *impolluti*, *expertes veneris etiam legitimæ*. *Qui inviolati corporis virginitate perpetua fruuntur*, says Minucius.²

4. In the Epistles of IGNATIUS³ there is a harshness of style, but a lively spirit, and a noble enthusiasm, especially in that to the Romans.

¹ Inquiry into the Miraculous Powers, &c. p. 67.

² Octav. c. 31. Concerning such magical rites, see Broukhusius on Tibullus, El. i. 11. 45; Fabricius, Bibl. Antiq. pp. 417, 419; and Havercamp's Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 23. *Si pueros in eloquium oraculi elidunt.* Junius thinks that this relates to the sacrificing of children, which kind of divination was called βρεφομαντεία, *pædomantia*.

³ IGNATIUS, surnamed *Theophorus*, was one of the earliest martyrs of whom any authentic record remains. Nora, in Sardinia, has been mentioned as the place of his birth; but it does not seem to possess any real claim to that honour. His parentage is equally uncertain; and little that is entitled to credit has reached us respecting his early history. There was a current tradition that he was the child whom our Saviour set before him as a pattern of humility (Matt. xviii. 3); but the legend seems to have originated in a signification of which the name Θεοφόρος, if accented on the antepenultima, admits, rather than the name to have been derived from the circumstance in question. Indeed, Ignatius himself, when brought before Trajan, explained the designation to mean ὁ Χριστὸν ἔχων ἐν στέροισι, *one who carried Christ in his bosom* (Mart. Ignat. c. 2); and Chrysostom says expressly that he had never seen the Lord. He had, however, the advantage of a personal acquaintance

He tells the *Ephesians* that he had a design to write them another letter, and to instruct them in some points, *μάλιστα ἐὰν*

with the Apostles ; and, together with his friend Polycarp, had received instruction from the beloved disciple St. John. According to Eusebius (H. E. iii. 2), he succeeded *Euodius* in the bishopric of Antioch in Syria (A. D. 69) ; but Theodoret (Decl. i.) attributes his consecration to St. Peter. As in the case of Clement, therefore, Euodius and Ignatius may have been set over the Jewish and Gentile converts respectively ; and, at the death of the former, the entire charge of the Antiochic Church may have devolved upon the latter. Against this conjecture, however, which is that of Baronius, we have the concurring testimony of Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, that he was simply the successor of Euodius ; and he may have received imposition of hands from the Apostles, then living, as recorded by Chrysostom. Of his episcopal administration, no particular memoranda have been preserved ; but zeal for the Christians in general, and devoted attachment to his flock in particular, were clearly the mainspring of his conduct. Heresies and schisms were his peculiar aversion ; and Chrysostom has preserved a remarkable saying, which Grabe, with great probability, attributes to him, that *not even the blood of martyrdom could wash out the stain of these grievous sins*.

In the ninth year of his reign, Trajan entered Antioch at the head of his victorious army, which he was about to lead against the Parthians. The horrors of persecution immediately commenced ; and Ignatius, anxious to divert the calamity from his people, forced himself into the imperial presence, with the view of kindling the rage of Trajan against himself. For a full account of this interview and its consequences, the reader is referred to the "Acts of his Martyrdom," which were written by eye-witnesses of the whole transaction, who accompanied him from Antioch to Rome, and were present at his death. Although the latter portion of these "Acts" were appended to the original document in a later age, the body of the work has every appearance of authenticity. Suffice it to add, that, on his arrival in the imperial city, he was led before the Prætor ; one of the great festivals was fixed for his execution ; and, before a vast concourse of spectators, he was torn in pieces by wild beasts in the amphitheatre.

The date of the martyrdom of Ignatius, and therefore of his Epistles, which were written on his journey from Antioch to Rome, is reckoned by *Basnage* among the obscurities of chronology ; and there is, as might be expected, much diversity of opinion respecting it. The "Acts of his Martyrdom" state expressly that he was condemned by Trajan *in person*, who came to Antioch in the *ninth* year of his reign, which answers to A. D. 106. Now there is no other record of the arrival of the emperor at Antioch before the year 112 ; and he was certainly there in the year 116, when the city was visited by a tremendous earthquake, during which he narrowly escaped from the ruin of the house in which he resided. Pearson, Grabe, and others would therefore substitute the *nineteenth* year for the *ninth* ; or, in Greek numerals, *ιθ'* for *θ'* ; and it will readily be granted that the *ι* might easily have been displaced. It so happens, however, that a subsequent statement in the "Acts" (c. 6) places the good bishop's martyrdom under the consulate of *Sura* and *Senecius*, which corresponds with the year 107 ; and in this date both Eusebius and Jerome agree. Since, therefore, preparations were certainly making for the Parthian war as early as the year in question, Trajan may possibly have been at Antioch about that period, and passed sentence upon the bishop as stated in the "Acts," according to which

ὁ Κύριός μοι ἀποκαλύψει, *especially if the Lord should reveal anything to me.*⁴ Whence it seems not improbable that he had been favoured with some revelations. The same inference may be made from these words to the *Philadelphians*:—*When I exhorted you to adhere to your bishop, presbyters, and deacons, some of you suspected that I had been informed of dissensions amongst you; μάρτυς δέ μοι ἐν ᾧ δέδεμαι, ὅτι ἀπὸ σαρκὸς ἀνθρωπίνης οὐκ ἔγνων· τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐκήρυσσε λέγων τάδε, Χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπσκοποῦ μηδὲν ποιεῖτε.*⁵

To the *Romans*⁶ he says:—Ζῶν γὰρ γράφω ὑμῖν, ἐρῶν τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν. Ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλόϋλον· ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν, καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοὶ, ἔσωθέν μοι λέγον, Δεῦρο πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. There is in this something very sublime and pathetic. The expression ὕδωρ λαλοῦν, resembles the *vocales undæ* which inspired the poets and prophets. Stat. Silv. i. 2. 6. *Et de Pieriis vocalem fontibus undam.*

the day on which he suffered was the 20th of December, A. D. 107, in about the eightieth year of his age.

The question of the *genuineness* of the Ignatian Epistles has been already disposed of. See above, p. 33. These are written in an animated, but inflated, style; and bespeak a mind stored with a knowledge of Christ and of the Gospel, rather than with the treasures of human learning. They breathe the genuine spirit of Christian devotion; they enforce the purest precepts, and abound in earnest exhortations to faith in the Redeemer, and obedience to his commands. The Epistle to Polycarp sets forth the character and duties of the Christian minister in the most lively and interesting colours. It exhorts him to watchfulness; to prayer and meditation; and to public and private intercourse with his flock. All the other Epistles, with the exception of that to the Romans, which exhibits most forcibly the feelings and temper of mind with which the writer was preparing to suffer for the sake of Christ, turn for the most part upon the same subjects. They open with an introductory greeting to the members of the church to which they are addressed; insist strongly upon the blessings of Church union, public worship, and submission to ecclesiastical rulers; exhort all men to constant prayer for themselves and others; warn them against false teachers; and inculcate the paramount importance of faith, repentance, and good works. Although their hasty composition did not admit of much doctrinal exposition, they contain the most explicit intimation of the eternal pre-existence of Christ, of the union of the divine and human nature in his person, of the necessity of his atonement, and of the influences of the Holy Spirit (Ephes. cc. 1, 7, 8, 15, 19, 20; Magn. 6, 7, 8; Smyrn. 4; Polyc. 8). In a word, they are most interesting and important documents of the early church of Christ.—EDIT. ⁴ Ephes. c. 20.

⁵ Philad. c. 7. [In these passages Ignatius seems to have borrowed his mode of expression from St. Paul (1 Cor. xiv. 30; Eph. i. 13, 14). They do not necessarily imply that he had either received, or expected, any direct revelation.—EDIT.]

⁶ Rom. c. 7.

An oracle of Apollo Dephicus given to Julian, and preserved by Cedrenus :—

Εἶπατε τῷ βασιλεῖ, χαμαὶ πέσε δαίδαλος αὐλά.
Οὐκέτι Φοῖβος ἔχει καλύβαν, οὐ μάντιδα δάφνην,
Οὐ παγὰν λαλέουσιν· ἀπέσβετο καὶ λάλον ὕδωρ.

In these verses, which, to do them justice, are elegant, Apollo, to raise Julian's compassion, deplores the silence of his Oracles, and of the *speaking streams*. In the first line read βασιλῆι. Anacreon. Carm. 13. Οἱ δὲ Κλάρου Παρ' ὄχθαις δαφνηφόροις Φοίβου λάλον πiónτες ὕδωρ μεμρνότες βοῶσιν.

Vetus interpres (says Cotelarius) :—Et non est in me ignis amans aliquam aquam; sed vivens et loquens est in me. *Hoc est Græce*; Καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλοῦν τι ὕδωρ· ζῶν δὲ καὶ λαλοῦν, αὐτὸ λαλούμενον ἐν ἐμοί. In Interpolatâ, Καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλοῦν τι· ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν, ἀλλόμενον ἐν ἐμοί. Et non est in me ignis qui aliquid amet: sed aqua viva, intra me saliens. *Ex antiquo interprete*; et non est in me, aqua autem alia viva manet in me. *Legebat quippe ἄλλο et μένει, loco ἀλλόμενον: et omisit quæ non intelligebat. Apud Metaphrastem, quem sequuntur Græci in Menæo*; Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλόῦλον· ὕδωρ δὲ μᾶλλον ζῶν καὶ λαλοῦν ἐν ἐμοί. Et non est in me ignis amans materiæ: aqua vero potius vivens et loquens in me. *Perplaceret mihi*; Καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλόῦλον· ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν, καὶ ἀλλόμενον ἐν ἐμοί. *Nam φιλόῦλον Julianus Ignatii interpolati codex retinuit: ἀλλόμενον autem confirmatur per illud Johannis iv. 14.* τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Aqua quam ego dabo ei, fiet in eo fons aquæ salientis in vitam æternam. *Græci conjunctim*; Οὐκ ἔσχες πῦρ φιλόῦλον ἐν σοί, Ἰγνάτιε· ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν μᾶλλον καὶ λαλοῦν, Δεῦρο πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· ὕδωρ τὸ ἀλλόμενον, τὸ ἐκ ζωῆς εἰς ζωὴν μετοχετεύον ἡμᾶς. Le Clerc says, *Est in Exemplari Græco, πῦρ φιλόῦλον. Ignis materialis est φιλόῦλος, amans materiæ; quæ nempe alitur. Sed spiritualis ignis, quo urebatur Ignatius, materiæ, hoc est, rerum corporearum, amans non erat. Quod est nonnihil coactum, ut et sequentia de aquâ in eo loquente. Sed sancti viri sermo refertus est ejusmodi violentis adlusionibus.*

The λαλοῦν ὕδωρ must not be altered: it is sufficiently confirmed by the citations of Cotelarius in this very note where he is inclined to reject it; and it is more elegant and proper than

Le Clerc imagined. Ignatius, who was a Syrian, and Bishop of Antioch, was well acquainted with the *Oracle of Apollo Daphnæus*, and with the *Castalian fountain*, which were at his door, and which are frequently mentioned by ecclesiastical writers. Sozomen, in his description of *Daphne*, says, Ἦν γὰρ ἐνθάδε Δαφναίου Ἀπόλλωνος περικαλλὲς ἄγαλμα, καὶ νεὼς μεγαλοφυῶς τε καὶ φιλοτίμως ἐξεργασμένος· ἐπιστεύετο δὲ παρὰ τοῖς τάδε πρεσβεύουσι, ρεῖν αὐτόθι καὶ ὕδωρ μαντικὸν ἀπὸ Κασταλίας τῆς πηγῆς, ὁμοίως τῆς ἐν Δελφοῖς ἐνεργείας τε καὶ προσηγορίας λαχούσης.⁷

Ignatius, therefore, opposes to the *speaking prophetic waters* of the Pagans, the *living waters* mentioned by our Lord;⁸ which *speak* better and nobler things than the fabulous and poetic fountains. The interpolator, who could not put himself in the place of Ignatius, and had not the same thoughts and images which arose in the mind of the martyr, flung away ὕδωρ λαλοῦν, the *speaking water*, which he understood not, and for which he had no taste, and put in ὕδωρ ἀλλόμενον to make it a closer copy from St. John. In the interpolated Epistle πῦρ φιλοῦν τι is absurd; but φιλόῦλον πῦρ makes good sense. He who in this passage, which we have been examining, can prefer the *larger* to the *shorter* Epistle, must be a critic, who, of different expressions, likes the worst the best, and should be fed with chaff.⁹

They who contend for the *larger* Epistle would do well to weigh one thing, which they never seem to think of; namely, that, whilst they want to support I know not what, they are hurting the reputation of an Apostolical Father, whom they have in great esteem: for if the passages which I have already pointed out, and those which others have censured, could be

⁷ H. E. v. 19.

⁸ John iv. 14.

⁹ Notwithstanding the ingenious criticism of Jortin, the true reading of the passage, as restored by the critics, seems to be this: Ζῶν γὰρ γράφω ὑμῖν, ἐρῶν τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταυρῶται, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοὶ πῦρ φιλοῦντι (sic), ὕδωρ δὲ ζῶν ἀλλόμενον ἐν ἐμοὶ, [καὶ] ἔσωθέν μοι λέγον, Δεῦρο πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. The meaning will appear from the following paraphrastic translation:—*I am still alive to write to you, though desirous of death; for Christ, who is my love, has been crucified for me; so that, loving as I do my heavenly Redeemer, the fire, which worldly desires are wont to kindle, is extinguished within me; and a well of living water, springing up into everlasting life* (John iv. 14, vii. 38), *murmurs within me, come unto the Father.* Others refer the words ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταυρῶται to the *carnal lusts and affections*, which Ignatius had crucified (Gal. v. 24); but the above interpretation is more suitable to the context, and embodies the two ideas in one.—EDIT.

shewed to be genuine, Ignatius would be much less valued than he is, by men of sense and judgment. But though the shorter Epistles are on many accounts preferable to the larger, yet I will not affirm that they have undergone no alteration at all.

Ignatius suffered under Trajan about the beginning of the second century. Here was a good man put to death by a good emperor¹; but the Pagans then began to perceive that Chris-

¹ Trajan had many excellent qualities; and Pope Gregory (Bayle's Dict. in v. *Trajan*) is said to have prayed his soul out of hell, though Tillemont seems to give no credit to the story, since he passes it by in silence, and pronounces a sentence of reprobation upon the emperor. "Ses cendres furent reçues à Rome en triomphe, dans un char sur lequel on avait mis son image: et l'on a encore des marques de ce triomphe, si lugubre pour tout le monde, et surtout pour celui qu'on voulait relever par ces honneurs imaginaires, et que le vrai Dieu punissait dans les enfers." (*Hist. des Emp.* tom. ii. p. 205). Amongst other commendable things which Trajan did, he relaxed the tribute called *Vicesima*, so as to make it less burdensome.

Dio Cassius says, that Augustus established a treasury for the payment of the army, and upon a deficiency (many ways being proposed by the senators, and all of them rejected), he fixed upon this expedient, which seems to have been of his own contriving, though he fathered it upon Julius Cæsar:—that a *twentieth* should be paid into the treasury of all inheritances, and legacies bequeathed by will, from which, however, he exempted those who were near of kin. He also excepted those who were poor; by which I suppose was meant that when the inheritance was small and under a certain value, and the inheritor also was poor, nothing was demanded. (See Dio, L. lv. p. 566.)

Augustus contributed largely to this fund out of his own income; and, as he had many legacies left him, he must have often paid his *twentieth*. However, the Romans, as Dio tells us afterwards, were excessively uneasy at this tax till Augustus, by convincing them that a better could not be contrived, and by putting them in fear of something worse, persuaded them to be quiet (L. lvi. p. 588). Thus it continued; and the younger Pliny, a very competent judge, and a very honest man mentions it, not without approbation, as one of those necessary evils, which was the least oppressive. *The twentieth*, says he, *is a tax tolerable enough, and easy to the inheritor, if he is not related to the deceased; but very hard, if he is near of kin: and he commends Nerva and Trajan for mitigating this law in favour of new-made citizens, who, it seems, had been obliged to pay the twentieth, howsoever related to the testator; as also for moderating it in some other instances, which deserve to be perused (Paneg. ch. 37, &c.)* When a person died intestate, it is to be supposed that the heir-at-law was subject to the same tax, if he came not within the degrees of relation which were exempted.

This tribute must have amounted to a prodigious sum; for the Roman empire was of a vast extent, the nobility and gentry were very rich, and often had no children to inherit their fortunes, and the arts of flattering the rich by those who were called *Heredipetæ*, or *legacy-hunters*, were much practised at Rome: so that many legacies were continually left to friends, to companions in iniquity, to freed-men and parasites; and this by the way, suggests one reason, not observed by Dio, why much clamour was made at Rome against the tax.

tianity, if it prevailed, would prove the ruin of their religion; and some of them probably persuaded Trajan to act contrary to his disposition, which was mild and placable. Pliny,² in his Epistle to that emperor, says that in his province the temples had been in a manner deserted, sacrificing left off, and the worship of the gods neglected. Trajan forbid the Christians to be sought after, and yet ordered them to be punished if convicted. *O sententiam necessitate confusam! negat inquirendos, ut innocentes; et mandat puniendos, ut nocentes.*—*Quid temet ipsum censurâ circumvenis? Si damnas, cur non inquirens? si non inquirens, cur non et absolvis?* Thus Tertullian³ inveighs, ingeniously enough, against the inconsistency and absurdity of this sentence, and has had the good fortune to engage most of his readers in the same way of thinking; and yet, after all, the Emperor's decree was not quite so absurd as Tertullian imagined. Trajan had no hatred towards the men, and pitied their case, but disliked the religion for the reason above mentioned: therefore he was willing to treat the Christians gently; but would neither repeal the laws to which they were obnoxious, nor give them leave to exercise their religion freely.

Ignatius expressed an earnest desire to suffer for the sake of Christ, and a great joy at the expectation of it; but it appears not that he rashly sought or provoked danger.⁴ To him might

What made the taxes in general heavy to the Romans, and to the nations which were in subjection to them, was that they were farmed and collected by the *Publicans*;—a sort of sharpers, who were troublesome everywhere, especially in the remoter provinces: so that the government was forced, from time to time, to pare their nails, and to browbeat them, and to make laws, in some of which they are set out in sorry colours. (See Digest, L. xxxix. Tit. iv. 12.) Whether this method deserves any notice and consideration, is submitted to those whom it concerns.

² Plin. Epist. x. 97.

³ Tertul. Apol. c. 2.

⁴ It has been imagined that the undaunted courage with which the early martyrs endured, or rather courted, the cruel deaths with which they were threatened, savoured strongly of romance, and betrayed a degree of impatience under the severe dispensations of Providence, rather than of devout resignation to the Divine will. Such an imputation, however, can only have originated in an undue attention to the peculiar circumstances of the times. The ancient Martyrologies, it is true, abound with stories bordering very closely upon fiction; but in the more authentic histories of the primitive martyrs, there is nothing which can detract, however slightly, from their testimony to the truth of that religion, to which they bore witness with their lives. Their desire of martyrdom was unquestionably ardent and passionate; for they considered, with St. Paul, that to them *to die was gain*; and that, not more for their own sakes than for the peace of the brethren. They hoped, by their own par-

be^s applied these lines of Lucan, which suit him as if they were made for him :—

Projeci vitam, comites, totusque futuræ
Mortis agor stimulis.—Agnoscere solis
Permissum est, quos jam tangit vicinia fati,
Victurosque dei celant, ut vivere durent,
Felix esse mori.

He speaks of himself with modesty and humility. He exhorts the Christians to live peaceably together, and to pay a high regard to their bishops and pastors, and has gone too far in his expressions ; but it is something of an excuse for him that the state of the times led him to it. It was to be feared lest the heretics, who in those days were vile persons, should seduce the unwary ; and mutual quarrels might have proved fatal to the common cause. A house ill cemented, and beaten with the storms of persecution, could not have stood.

In his *Epistle* to the *Romans* he desires them not to interpose, and by any ways endeavour to preserve him from martyrdom ; and he says that the wild beasts had feared and refused to touch some⁶ who had been thrown to them, which he hoped would not happen to him :—ἀ [θηρία] καὶ κολακεύσω συντόμως με καταφαγεῖν, οὐχ ὥσπερ τινῶν δειλαινόμενα οὐχ ἤψαντο.⁷ So afterwards, when Blandina was exposed, none of the beasts would kill her, says Eusebius ;⁸ who took it from an authentic history of the martyrs of Lions in Gaul. In Diocletian's persecution, Eusebius was eye-witness to such a thing ; and somewhat of

ticular sufferings, to avert those of the church ; and, by the fortitude which they exhibited, to attest their unshaken belief in the revelation of the Gospel. Thus we find that the most eminent of the early martyrs were numbered among the bishops and rulers of the church ; and their dying prayers were offered for the peace and welfare of their flocks.—EDIT.

⁵ Le Clerc, Hist. Eccl. p. 566.

⁶ Rom. c. 5. I know not whether Ignatius had in view any Christian martyrs, or Daniel who was cast into the den of lions. [It is plain from the very instances which Jortin immediately adduces, that the martyrs are meant.—EDIT.]

⁷ In Ignatius and Eusebius it is ἤψαντο. Stephanus reads ἤψατο, which probably is right, because μὴ θέλη follows. But, as to the rule in our grammars, *Neutra pluralia gaudent verbo singulari*, there are abundance of exceptions to it, particularly in the Scriptures. See in the LXX., Genes. xlviii. 6 ; Isai. lxiv. 3 ; Zach. xiii. 7 ; and Matt. vi. 26, x. 21 ; Marc. v. 13, xiii. 12 ; Luc. xxiv. 11 ; Joh. x. 8 ; Rev. xxi. 4. So Homer. Il. τ. 29. μή τοι ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ σῆσι μελόντων. [It is scarcely necessary to observe that the case in question comes under the ordinary exception, relating to *animated beings*.—EDIT.]

⁸ Euseb. H. E. v. i.

this kind is related in the Acts of Perpetua. This forbearance of the beasts, though it did not save the lives of the martyrs, yet it animated and comforted the distressed Christians; it reproved the Pagans for their worse⁹ than brutish cruelty; and it might possibly be the happy occasion of converting some, who might be inclined to say at such a sight,—*non hæc sine numine Divûm Eveniunt.*

If the lions had been let loose upon Ignatius in the amphitheatre, and had retired and left him unhurt, or fawned upon him, the spectators might possibly have been moved of themselves, or incited by his friends, who were present, to beg the life, or at least the reprieve, of a venerable old man, whom the very brutes had spared, and who seemed protected by heaven: and such kind of favours were seldom refused to those assemblies. Thus Androcles was saved by the good offices of his old and grateful friend, the lion; and had his life, and liberty, and the lion, given to him, at the request of the people.¹ The emperor, it will be said, had condemned him to the lions. But what then? If the lions would not kill him, the magistrate might, without offence, if he had been so disposed, have respited the martyr's death, till the emperor's farther pleasure should be known.

It must be confessed after all, that such wonders are somewhat ambiguous, because wild beasts are not always in a fighting humour, and might be terrified by the strangeness of the place and noise of the populace; and therefore we find that they sometimes used fire, and whips, and other methods to irritate them. But even these methods were tried in vain, says Eusebius; speaking of what happened, to his own knowledge.

Josephus relates that one of the Ptolemies exposed the Jews of Egypt, in the Hippodrome, to be killed by his elephants, whom he had intoxicated with wine, to make them more furious; but the beasts, instead of assaulting the poor Jews, turned upon the spectators, and destroyed many of them. This, and some terrible appearance so frightened the king, that he

⁹ Mitius inveni, quam te, genus omne ferarum. [Ignatius (Epist. Rom. c. 5) represents himself as δεδεμένος δέκα λεοπάρδοις, ὃ ἐστὶ στρατιωτῶν τάγμα, οἳ καὶ εὐεργετούμενοι χεῖρους γίνονται.—EDIT.]

¹ A. Gellius, v. 14. "Populi in arenâ præcipuum jus," says Lipsius, "et ad ejus voluntatem domini plerumque se conformabant."—Saturn. ii. 22.

acknowledged the Divine interposition, and set them free, and conferred many favours on them. Josephus adds, that the Jews of Alexandria kept a day in commemoration of this deliverance²

It was not necessary that the Christians should be miraculously saved: the favours promised to them by their master were of another kind. Jesus Christ would not save himself from crucifixion: but he struck those to the ground who came to seize him; and the troubled elements bore witness to his dignity and to his innocence. St. Stephen's martyrdom was also attended with miraculous circumstances. It is therefore no insuperable objection to any wonders which are related to have accompanied the death of the martyrs, that they did not preserve the sufferers. If indeed they are not well attested, or if they appear to have been of the trifling useless kind, and void of all *moral import*; if milk instead of blood flowed from their wounds, and sweet odours issued from the faggots, and pigeons flew out of their mouths; the case is altered, and there is some reason to doubt of such miracles. So, again, if a monk smelt like a civet-cat when he was dead, who smelt like a pole-cat when he was alive, this can hardly pass for a proper and sufficient proof of his sanctity.

The repeated wish of Ignatius was, that he might be torn to pieces and eaten up; that, as he says, he might give no one the trouble of paying him funeral rites. *Vota suos habuere deos*—His wish was accomplished, and of his body very little was left undevoured.

The account of his martyrdom³ has the appearance of being genuine, except the last section, which contains the *dreams* of his friends, and which might possibly be added by another hand.⁴ They who reject all the epistles of Ignatius as spurious, reject also the account of his martyrdom. It is inconceivable, say they, that Trajan should have sent an old man, by land, at a great expense, attended with soldiers, from Syria to Rome, instead of casting him to the lions at Antioch. It is also impro-

² Contr. Apion. ii. 5. See also 3 Maccab. cc. 3, 4, 5; and Prideaux, Connect. ii. 2. vol. ii. p. 119. ed. Oxon. To this it will perhaps be said, that it is no marvel if a *drunken beast* turned upon his driver.

³ In the *Patres Apostolici*, vol. ii. p. 157.

⁴ See Le Clerc.

bable that, when he was thus guarded and conducted, he should have been permitted to converse with the Christians, and to give them instructions, and to write epistles, in the several cities through which he passed. The answer is obvious:—Trajan sent him by land on purpose to show him about, and to make an example of him as of a ringleader of the sect,⁵ and to deter the Christians from preaching and spreading their religion; and for the same reason he sent him to be executed at Rome, where there were many Christians, and which, as it was the capital of the world, so was it the head quarters of all sorts of religions. *Repressa in præsens exitiabilis superstitio rursus erumpebat, non modo per Judæam, originem ejus mali, sed per Urbem etiam, quo cuncta undique atrocia aut pudenda confluunt, celebranturque.*⁶ Dionysius Halicarnassensis observes that though there were six hundred nations, which, in a manner, had taken up their abode at Rome, each of which had its own sacred rites, yet no foreign religion had been publicly received by the Romans, or at least not till they had purged and corrected it, and rendered it conformable to their own. In the time of Trajan, Christianity had made such a progress, that the Romans were jealous, and uneasy at it.

The soldiers who had the custody of Ignatius, made a considerable advantage of him; and, as we observed before, took money of the Christians for the small indulgence which they showed to their prisoner; and would have been glad that he had written a hundred epistles, if they could have obtained a present for each.

5. POLYCARP⁷ suffered under Marcus Aurelius (about A. D.

⁵ Παραδειγματίζειν.

⁶ Tacitus, Ann. xv. 44.

⁷ POLYCARP is generally supposed to have been the angel of the Church of Smyrna, to whom the Epistle is directed to be sent in Rev. ii. 8. The contents of this Epistle accord precisely with his history, and the state of the Church at that time; and the part which the Jews took in his martyrdom was a natural result of the conduct there ascribed to them. Of his early life nothing is known, except that, in his childhood, he was sold as a slave to a noble lady of Smyrna, who bequeathed him her estates; which, though very extensive, were scarcely adequate to his unlimited charities. On the death of *Bucolus*, bishop of the see, he was appointed his successor, and consecrated by the Apostles, at the immediate suggestion of St. John, upon whose instructions he had constantly attended, and with whom he had lived on terms of the closest intimacy and attachment. The true spirit of Christian love influenced all his actions; and when at Rome, whither he had gone to confer on the subject of the

169); of whose martyrdom we have an account in Eusebius^s, who took it from an epistle of the church of Smyrna, of which he inserted the greater part in his history. Usher found and published a copy of this epistle, and it is inserted in Le Clerc's *Patres Apostolici*. In the conclusion there is a foolish note of one Pionius the transcriber. There are some differences (though most of them small) between Eusebius and the epistle; as, for example, in the *dream* or *vision* of Polycarp; in the doxology at the end of his prayer; and in the description of the martyr standing in the flames, ὡς ἄρτος ὀπτώμενος, *as a loaf whilst it is baking*, which is not in Eusebius.

The wonders relating to his martyrdom are these:—1. He had a dream or vision, portending what should befall him. Much

Paschal controversy, his mild and engaging demeanour obtained for him, not only the respect of his episcopal opponent *Anicetus*, but the affection of the whole Christian community. Of his resistance to every perversion of the truth, and his unflinching adherence to the doctrine which he had received from the Apostles, his pupil Irenæus speaks expressly (Hær. iii. 3. 4, and ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 20); and so great was his influence in checking the growth of heresy and disaffection, that the leaders of the various sects would fain have procured his countenance and support. Upon one occasion, being thus accosted by Marcion in the street, "*Dost thou own us, Polycarp?*" he replied, "*I own thee to be the first-born of Satan.*" It is also related of him, that, while at Ephesus, he was desirous of going into a bath; but, seeing Cerinthus there before him, he departed, saying to his companions, "*Let us flee hence, lest the bath fall upon us, while Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is in it.*" This story, however, is differently told by Irenæus and Theodoret; Epiphanius tells it of Ebion instead of Cerinthus; and there are other circumstances which render the credibility of the narrative deservedly suspected. There is much less reason to suspect the accuracy of a statement which Irenæus has given upon his own authority, that if any heretical doctrines chanced to be started in his presence, he would stop his ears, and exclaim, "*Good God, to what times hast thou reserved me, that I should hear such things!*" (Epist. ad Florin. ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 20.) For a long period after his return to Smyrna, he continued to watch over his charge, and to promote, by his advice and influence, the welfare of the neighbouring Churches. He survived his friend Ignatius about sixty years; and in extreme old age, in the reign of M. Antoninus, sealed his testimony to the truth of Christ with his blood. According to Irenæus, Polycarp wrote several letters to the Churches bordering on Smyrna; but none of his writings were known to Eusebius and Jerome, except his *Epistle to the Philippians*, which is still extant. This Epistle was evidently written shortly after the death of Ignatius, and may be assigned, without hesitation, to the year 108. Of its intrinsic genuineness there is not the slightest question among the learned, though it may possibly have been slightly interpolated. It consists almost entirely of pastoral admonitions and exhortations, delivered in a simple and comprehensive style, closely analogous to that of the sacred writings.—EDIT.

^s H. E. iv. 15.

the same thing is said to have happened to Socrates⁹. Καὶ προσευχόμενος ἐν ὀπτασίᾳ γέγονε, πρὸ τριῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ συλληφθῆναι αὐτὸν, καὶ εἶδεν προσκεφάλαιον αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ πυρὸς κατακαίόμενον· καὶ στραφεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς συνόντας αὐτῷ προφητικῶς, Δεῖ με ζῶντα κατακαυθῆναι. 2. A voice from heaven encouraged him. Τῷ δὲ Πολυκάρπῳ εἰσιόντι εἰς τὸ στάδιον, φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐγένετο· Ἰσχυε καὶ ἀνδρίζου, Πολύκαρπε. Καὶ τὸν μὲν εἰπόντα οὐδεὶς εἶδε, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν τῶν ἡμετέρων οἱ παρόντες ἤκουσαν. 3. The fire would not burn him. Μεγάλῃ δὲ ἐκλαμψάσει φλογὸς, θαῦμα μέγα εἶδομεν, οἷς ἰδεῖν ἐδόθη· οἱ καὶ ἐτηρήθημεν, εἰς τὸ ἀναγγεῖλαι τοῖς λοιποῖς τὰ γενόμενα. Τὸ γὰρ πῦρ καμάρας εἶδος ποιήσαν, ὥσπερ ὀθόνη πλοίου ὑπὸ πνεύματος πληρουμένη, κύκλῳ περιετείχισε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ μάρτυρος· καὶ ἦν μέσον οὐχ ὡς σὰρξ καιομένη, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄρτος ὀπτώμενος, ἢ ὡς χρῦσος καὶ ἄργυρος ἐν καμίνῳ πυρούμενος. 4. A sweet smell came out of the pile. Καὶ γὰρ εὐωδίας τοσαύτης ἀντελαβόμεθα, ὡς λιβανωτοῦ πνέοντος, ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς τῶν τιμίων ἀρωμάτων. 5. A great quantity of blood came from him, which seems to be mentioned as something marvellous. 6. A dove at the same time came out of the wound. Πέρας οὖν ἰδόντες οἱ ἄνομοι οὐ δυνάμενον αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς δαπανηθῆναι, ἐκέλευσαν προσελθόντα αὐτῷ κομφέκτορα παραβῦσαι ξιφίδιον· καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντος, ἐξῆλθε περιστερὰ καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, ὥστε κατασβέσαι τὸ πῦρ, καὶ θαυμάσαι πάντα τὸν ὄχλον, εἰ τοσαύτη τις διαφορὰ μεταξὺ τῶν ἀπίστων καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν.

From the agreement between the epistle and Eusebius in the main (the *dove* excepted), it appears that we have the epistle now as Eusebius had it, or nearly so; and since Eusebius speaks of it as of an ancient and well-known writing, ἐγγράφως ἔτι φερόμενον, if it was a forgery, it must have been composed long before his time. But, excepting the marvellous parts, the rest of the narration has all the appearance of truth and of fact. The manner of apprehending the martyr, the speeches of the proconsul, the behaviour and prayer of Polycarp, the rage of the populace, and particularly of the Jews, the zeal of the Christians and their affection for their bishop,—all is consistent and probable; and many little incidents are mentioned which have not the air of fiction¹.

⁹ See above, p. 56.

¹ There cannot be the least question of the genuineness of this valuable document, which was read publicly in the churches of Asia, long after the death of the martyr,

The Christians who accompanied Polycarp at his execution, highly revered, and almost adored him. They attended with a full expectation, as we may suppose, of seeing some strange events; and the sight of their dear and honoured friend, thus dying, might raise in them a tumult of passions, and take away some of the sedateness which may be requisite in forming an accurate judgment.

Let us now consider the miraculous parts of the story.—I see no reason to doubt of Polycarp's vision, or to think it improbable that this apostolical Father, and holy martyr, should have been forewarned of his sufferings, and prepared to expect them; and enabled to give his friends this proof that God was with him, and assisted him. He himself interpreted the vision, signifying by what death he should glorify God. Without this intimation he could not have known that he should be condemned to the flames; because there were many other ways of destroying criminals, and of several martyrs, who at that time had been executed, not one was burnt. They were thrown to the beasts, as the epistle informs us, after having endured with amazing patience and courage the worst tortures which malicious cruelty could contrive; and when Polycarp was condemned, the populace requested that he might be exposed to the lions; and because it could not be done, they then chose to have him burnt. To this foreknowledge, which he had received of his death, he seems to allude in his last prayer at the stake; in which he blesses God for calling him to martyrdom, and prays that he may be received of him as an acceptable sacrifice, καθὼς προητοίμασας, καὶ προεφάνέρωσας, καὶ ἐπλήρωσας, ὁ ἀψευδὴς καὶ ἀληθινὸς Θεός.

For these reasons I cannot assent to the solution proposed by Middleton: ² *The foresight of his death and the manner of it, in the time of a cruel persecution, when his person was particularly hunted from village to village, as the principal and destined sacrifice, may reasonably be considered as the effect of common pru-*

at the annual commemoration of his sufferings. It was with this narrative in particular that Scaliger, as quoted a few pages onward by Jortin, was so sensibly affected, that he seemed to be no longer himself when he read it; and he observes that no good Christian could be too often employed in reading this and similar accounts of the sufferings of the early martyrs.—EDIT.

² Inquiry, p. 9.

dence, without recurring to anything miraculous. Polycarp prophesied that he should be burnt alive: the event was, that the fire could not burn him, its natural power being preternaturally suspended; and that he died by the sword. This, as the author of *the two previous questions* observes, is a difficulty. It will afford reason to doubt either of the prophecy, or of the miracle by which the power of the fire was restrained: and of the two, it were better to give up the latter than the former, if both cannot stand together. Tillemont was aware of this difficulty, and therefore supposes that Polycarp was killed by the fire, before he was wounded.³ But this solution is also attended with some difficulties. The epistle intimates no such thing, but rather that he died, partly at least, by the sword; and, if he perished by the flames, naturalists must determine, whether a man who dies in the fire, and then is run through, will bleed plentifully. One would not willingly have recourse to a miracle for the effusion of blood, because such a miracle could tend to no purpose. Le Moyne says, *Licet fuerit Polycarpus vulnere et telo confossus, tamen vivus arsit, et in pyra beatam suam animam efflavit*⁴. S. Basnage, who admits the rest of the account, hesitates at this part of it; at the effusion of blood⁵. Some, to reconcile the vision with the event, will perhaps say that the vision of the pillow consumed by fire was sufficiently completed by Polycarp's dying at the stake, and by the burning of his body after he was dead; and that, if there was a small error, it was in Polycarp's interpretation. *Prophetæ visorum suorum non semper fidi interpretes. Donum prophetias interpretandi prorsus erat distinctum a prophetiæ charismate*⁷.

³ Les Payens luy firent donner un coup d'épée.—Il ne faut pas doubter néanmoins qu'il ne fût mort dès auparavant, puisque Dieu luy avoit révélé qu'il devoit estre brûlé. *H. Ec. ii. 341.*

⁴ Proleg. ad Var. Sacr.

⁵ Unum est quod nos non satis capere profiteamur: *Confectorem propius accedere, etc.* Tantumne sanguinis, senili ex corpore pene exanguis ætateque confecto, manavit e vulnere, ut pyra ardens et magna satis penitus extincta sit? Cætera vero mirâ dulcedine alliciunt animos. *Annal. ii. p. 138.*

⁶ When a deacon, called *Sosius*, was performing divine service, his head appeared surrounded with flames, which portended his martyrdom. (*Surius Sept. 23.*) The writer might borrow this from Polycarp's vision, or from Virgil's (*Æn. ii. 682.*) *Ecce levis subito de vertice visus Iuli Fundere lumen apex*: or from the story of *Servius Tullius* in *Livy* (i. 39), *cui caput arsisse ferunt multorum in conspectu*. This *Sosius* was a companion of that *Januarius*, who works miracles to this day in Naples with wonderful perseverance.

⁷ Fell, on Cyprian.

As to the voice⁸ from heaven, there is nothing frivolous in such a miracle; it might be true: but yet it is a miracle which might be counterfeited. One single Christian might have made the speech from a house-top, near the *stadium*, and have laid concealed there; and if he kept his counsel, all his brethren might have been deceived by him. The human voice, if it be clear and strong, may be heard at a great distance. The Heralds in Homer had this accomplishment, and were *βοὴν ἀγαθοὶ*; and Darius Hystaspis had an Egyptian in the army, who was as good as a speaking-trumpet⁹, and who saved Darius and the army when they were in great danger, by the force of his lungs. If the voice had been accompanied with an unusual splendour in the air, or with an earthquake, or preceded by thunder and lightning in a clear sky, the wonder had been evident. The author of the Epistle observes that *the Christians*, who attended Polycarp, *heard this voice*; but says not a word of the Jews and Gentiles, and leaves us uncertain whether they heard it or no.

A sweet smell issued from the pile. This is surely a very suspicious miracle; and they who have defended the account of Polycarp's martyrdom, are willing to pass it over as fast as they can. They are in the right, for in truth it casts some dishonour upon the whole narration. The fact in all probability was true: scented wood is common in hot countries, and the odour might proceed from the fuel; for the people ran about to the baths and other places to get wood, and a Christian might also join with them, and bring a bundle of wood with aromatics enclosed in it, to honour the funeral of his Bishop. It had been an ancient fashion in various places to waste abundance of

⁸ When Constantius, an Arian emperor, was carried in funeral pomp, his friends affirmed that a choir of angels attended the procession, singing and playing in the air; and Gregory Nazianzen thought fit to record this miracle. *Ea subdit Nazianzenus, quibus fidem afferre nobis est difficillimum: Cum corpus, Tauro monte superato, ad paternam civitatem veheretur, vox quædam e summis locis a nonnullis audiebatur, velut psallentium et prosequentium; angelicorum, opinor, cœtuum: quod pietatis illi præmiū erat, funebrisque remuneratio. (Orat. 4.) Quæ figmenta ex Ariana officina prodiasse videntur.* (S. Basnage, *Ann.* ii. 863.) Gregory Nazianzen had a favourable opinion of Constantius; but Lucifer Calaritanus, Hilary, and Athanasius load him with reproaches, and call him *tyrant, anti-Christ, &c.* Thus you have fathers against fathers, and saints against saints.

⁹ Herod. iv. 141. Ἄνθρωπος Αἰγύπτιος φωνέων μέγιστον ἀνθρώπων.

aromatics in burning dead persons of rank and quality ; or those who threw themselves alive into the flames, in complaisance to the deceased, or in compliance with cruel custom, as the Indian wives ; or a philosopher, who now and then mounted the pile, and entertained the public with roast-meat, as the Gymnosophists, Calanus, &c. The writer of the Epistle would make us believe that these perfumes were conferred on Polycarp's pile miraculously, no doubt ; else it would not have been worth the recording. The Christians, however frugal in other respects, yet in these expenses were very profuse at the interment of their brethren. *Si Arabiae queruntur, says Tertullian, sciant Sabæi plures et cariores suas merces Christianis sepeliendis profligari, quam Diis fumigandis.*

This account of the yielding of the flames, of the voice, and of the sweet odour, might give occasion to later writers to apply these wonders to other Martyrs ; as they frequently do.¹ The history of *the aromatic scent of the sacred bones* would fill a moderate folio. By the help of this odour relics were discovered, and genuine bones distinguished from counterfeits ; and it was very easy to find out a Saint, without borrowing the lantern of Diogenes :—*Ubi ubi est, diu celari non potest.* Tillemont is excessively fond of this prodigy, and never fails to record it with great seriousness ; and indeed there is no reason to question the fact, for of all miracles it is the easiest to be performed, and therefore the least satisfactory. *Non bene olet, qui bene semper olet.* The Pagan goddesses also smelt very sweet, as the poets, to whom they were best known, testify. Virg. *Æn. i. 403. Ambrosiæque comæ divinum vertice odorem spiravere.* Ovid, *Fast. v. 8. Mansit odor ; posses scire fuisse deam.* The temple at Hierapolis smelt of the sweetest perfume, as the writer *de Dea Syria* assures us. In Abul-Feda's life of Mohammed, we are told that a most agreeable odour proceeded from his carcase after he was dead. *Copres*, a monk of the fourth century, is said to have stood half an hour in the midst of a great fire, unhurt, to confute a poor Manichæan doctor, who could not perform the same exploit.² *Helles*, another monk of those days, would carry fire in his bosom, which neither

¹ See Prudentius, *Œpe* *Œteph.* vi. 100, and Basil, *Hom. v.* ; not to mention many more.

² Rufinus in *Vit. Patrum.*

singed his clothes nor his skin.³ This miracle was wrought with a view to the proverb:—*Can a man take fire in his bosom, and his clothes not be burnt? Can one go upon hot coals, and his feet not be burnt?*⁴ But Solomon, as well as Bernard, *non vidit omnia*. This is what Pagans have pretended to do, as we shall see:—

incedunt per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso.

The arching of the flames, if it was just as the author of the Epistle relates it, must have been something preternatural: but the question is, whether the author's imagination did not impose upon him, and make him fancy a little more in it than there really was. If Polycarp had prophesied that his enemies could not and should not burn him, it had been remarkable indeed:⁵ but here is a martyr, who could not be burned, and who was run through without difficulty. Besides the seeming disagreement of the prediction and the event, one may reasonably ask, To what purpose this miracle? Nor is the question easily answered.

Yet that is not all: the miracle was not only of the useless kind, but it might have produced rather a bad than a good effect on the minds of the spectators. The Pagans had many examples in their fabulous and poetic history of men who had been unhurt in the flames; and they had also their priests and priestesses, who walked barefoot over the fire without harm: but these things were supposed by some Pagans to be tricks; by others to be magical operations; and, consequently, the inference made by the vulgar Pagans, and perhaps by the Jews, would have been, that Polycarp was an old magician, who had recourse, though in vain, to enchantments; and that his dæmon had secured him, for a time, from the flames, but could not protect him from the sword.⁶ It was the opinion

³ Sozomen H. E. vi. 28.

⁴ Prov. vi. 27, 28.

⁵ Therefore, as later authors improve upon their predecessors, the writers of the martyrdom of Romanus say, that, when he was condemned to the flames, he declared beforehand that the fire should not burn him, and accordingly a miraculous shower (borrowed it may be from the story of Cræsus in Herodotus) put it out. (*Prudentius*.)

⁶

“Summe Deûm, sancti custos Soractis Apollo,
Quem primi colimus, cui pineus ardor acervo
Pascitur; et medium freti pietate per ignem
Cultores multa premimus vestigia pruna.”—Virgil *Æn.* xi. 785.

of some that Cræsus had escaped the flames by the help of incantations.⁷

If we may be permitted to hazard a conjecture upon this occasion, we may suppose that the Jews and Pagans, full of rage, brought together wood enough to burn ten persons, and heaped it all round the martyr, and set fire to it in many places; which blazed up, as at the⁸ pile of Cræsus, *περὶ ἑσχάτα*, at the extremities on all sides, and⁹ arched over Polycarp. Upon this

Where *Servius* :—“*Freti pietate. Iste quidem hoc dixit ; sed Varro, ubique expugnator religionis, ait, cum quoddam medicamentum describeret : ‘Eo uti solent Hirpini, qui, ambulaturi per ignem, medicamento plantas tingunt.’”* *Plin. N. H. vii.* “*Haud procul urbe Roma, in Faliscorum agro, familiæ sunt paucae, quæ vocantur Hirpi. Hæ sacrificio annuo, quod fit ad montem Soractem Apollini, super ambustam ligni struem ambulantes non adurantur. Et ob id, perpetuo Senatusconsulto, militiæ omniumque aliorum munerum vacationem habent.”* *Strabo* :—“*Ἐν τοῖς Κασταβάλοις ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς Περασίας Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν, ὅπου φασὶ τὰς ἱερείας γυμνοῖς τοῖς ποσὶ δι’ ἀνθρακίᾱς βαδίζειν ἀπαθεῖς.*” *Le Clerc*, speaking of the water of jealousy (*Numb. v.*) says : “*An ultio divina perjurium illico sequeretur non docet Moses, et rara hæc videntur fuisse exempla. Hugo Grotius exempla ex Scriptoribus Ethnicis adfert fontium, quorum aquæ perjuros arguisse feruntur, nec rei fidem detrahit. Sed tot ficta miracula apud Ethnicos narrabantur, ut ulli credere vix possimus. Alia est ratio Hebræorum, etc. Multa quoque in infimi ævi historiis habemus de probationibus per ignem, per aquam, etc. quæ tam mihi nefas videatur omnia credere, quam omnia rejicere. Certe ut veri non sunt sat clara in iis argumenta, ita nec mendacii indicia manifestis notata sunt. Ideoque an vera sint, aut falsa, nos quidem scire non possumus.*” The custom of trying the innocence of suspected persons by fire, or boiling water, is very ancient ; for it is mentioned in *Soph. Ant. 270* :—

*Ἦμεν δ’ ἑτοιμοὶ καὶ μύδρους αἶρειν χερσίν,
καὶ πῦρ διέρπειν, καὶ θεοὺς ὀρκωμοτεῖν.*

And it lasted till the fourteenth century in Europe, and is said to continue still in some places. But the horrible rashness and the profane impudence of appealing thus to God, without his permission ; and of calling upon him to interpose miraculously ; and the injuries which on these occasions have been done to the innocent, and the favour which has been showed to the guilty ; incline us to think that no miracle of this kind was ever wrought at such trials, and that they who escaped used some tricks as well as the *Hirpi*. It would not be difficult to paint iron bars, so as to make them look as if they were red hot.

⁷ *Ἐφέσια γράμματα* ἐπὶ πῦρ γὰρ, τινὲς φασὶν, ἐκεῖνα ἦσαν, ὡς καὶ Κροῖσος ἐπὶ τῆς πυρᾶς εἰπὼν ὠφελήθη. *Πανσανίας* δὲ φησιν, ὅτι φωναὶ ἦσαν τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα φυσικὸν ἐμπεριέχουσιν νοῦν ἀλεξίκακον, ὡς καὶ Κροῖσον ἐπὶ πυρᾶς, φησὶ καὶ αὐτὸς, εἰπεῖν. (*Eustathius in Odyss., Suidas. Etymol. Magn.*) Of the same kind with the *Ephesian Letters* were these charms ; *Sista, Pista, Kista, Xista* :—and, *Daries, Dardaries, Astaries, Dissunapiter, Huat, Hamat.* &c. :—to which *Varro* and *Cato* ascribe great powers.

⁸ See the story in *Herodotus*.

⁹ Something not unlike this was seen at the martyrdom of *Porphyrius*. *Euseb. Mart. Pal. 11*, Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφθείσης ἔξω ἀπὸ μακροῦ ἀποστήματος κύκλῳ περὶ αὐτὸν τῆς πυρᾶς, ἐνθένδε καὶ κεῖθεν ἀφαρπάζοντα τῷ στόματι τὴν φλόγα, κ. τ. λ.

some of the Christians began to cry *a miracle* ; his enemies said that the man was *a magician*, and fearing, perhaps, lest something extraordinary should appear in his favour, called for the executioner to dispatch him quickly. There was no withstanding the giddy impatience of an irritated populace. The executioner complied, and ran Polycarp through, when he was almost dead and suffocated with the flames, and when perhaps his lower parts had been scorched ; and thus he perished partly by fire, and partly by the sword.

In order to reconcile the whole account, and to remove useless prodigies, it seems reasonable to suppose that there was nothing miraculous in the arching of the flames ; that the fire had almost killed the martyr when he was wounded ; and that the blood which issued from him quenched or damped the fire only on one side, and where it burned weakest.

The writer of the Epistle observes, that Polycarp stood in the fire, ὡς χρυσὸς καὶ ἄργυρος ἐν καμίνῳ πυρούμενος, alluding possibly to those passages of Scripture where the righteous are compared to gold and silver tried in the furnace ; or to what is said of Christ,¹ καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ, ὡς ἐν καμίνῳ πεπυρωμένοι. Eusebius uses the same kind of expression concerning Peter, who suffered martyrdom at the stake, in Diocletian's persecution : διὰ πυρὸς οἷα χρυσὸς ἀκραιφνέστατος.²

The story of the *dove* coming out of Polycarp's body,—which is in the Epistle, but not in Eusebius, or Rufinus, or Nicephorus, or two MSS. of the Latin translation of the Epistle,—arose, possibly, from a corruption of the text. The executioner stabbed him, and then ἐξῆλθε περιστερὰ καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, *a dove came out and abundance of blood*. It is not likely that the author would have related so marvellous a circumstance so concisely and coldly, in one single word, περιστερὰ, just as if he were ashamed of it, and wanted to get over it as fast he could : but he might have written, with a very small alteration, ἐξῆλθεν ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ πλῆθος αἵματος, ὥστε κατασβέσαι τὸ πῦρ, *a great quantity of blood issued out on, or to the left side, and put out the fire* (on that side) : after which, the commanding officer ordered his body to be laid upon the wood and consumed, and the Christians had leave to gather up his bones. Or we might read,—with an altera-

¹ Revel. i. 15.

² Mart. Pal. 10.

tion still smaller, and without striking out the *καὶ*,—ἐξῆλθεν ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, *there issued out EVEN so much blood, as to extinguish the fire.* The dove could scarcely be mentioned designedly by the author, who would have said something more, or nothing at all. The first conjecture is proposed by Le Moyne, but he writes it ἐξῆλθ' ἐπ' ἀριστερᾷ. I should prefer ἐξῆλθεν, to avoid poetic numbers; and besides, the *accusative plural* ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ, joined to a *verb of motion*, would be better than the *dative* or *ablative singular*, ἐπ' ἀριστερᾷ. Ἐξῆλθεν ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ, *exivit ad lævam*, as in Homer, *Il. m.* 239.

Εἴτ' ἐπὶ δέξι' ἴωσι πρὸς ἡῶ τ' ἡέλιόν τε,

Εἴτ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ τοίγε, ποτὶ ζόφον ἡερόεντα.

Genes. xiii. 9, εἰς ἀριστερὰ, εἰς δεξιὰ. And so very often in the LXX. Somebody ³ has proposed, ἐξῆλθε περισσεῖα καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, i. e. *there came out plenty and abundance of blood*; which is clumsy enough. Another improves upon it, and conjectures, ἐξῆλθε περισσεῖα ὕδατος καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, which is too bold, and passes the bounds of sober criticism.

When the virgin *Eulalia* was put to death, a dove, spotless and white as snow, flew out of her mouth, says Prudentius.⁴ This has made some suspect that the story of Polycarp's *dove* might be somewhat more ancient than the time of Prudentius, and give occasion to the fiction about *Eulalia's dove*. In the third century, when the Roman Christians were assembled together to choose a bishop, a dove came and sat upon Fabian's head, to point him out for that office. This rumour Eusebius inserted in his History;⁵ but he might as well have left it out.

³ Amongst other conjectures, one is, ἀπ' ἀριστερᾷ. It should have been ἀπ' ἀριστερᾶς, or ἀπ' ἀριστερῶν. *Le Clerc*, says Middleton, took περισσεῖα to be the true reading. How does this appear? Because he gave it in his edition of the *Apostolical Fathers*. And so would any fair editor, who ought to represent the reading of the manuscript in such a remarkable place. But *Le Clerc* says nothing against it in his notes. True; because he was in haste, which was often the case with him, and not disposed to discuss the question. In his *Ecclesiastical History*, he passes the *dove* over in silence, as not worthy to be mentioned (p. 729); and in his *Bibl. Chois.* (xxvi. p. 218) he absolutely rejects it as an interpolation. *Il n'y a rien de cette Colombe dans un MS. que le P. Ruinart cite, non plus que dans Eusèbe, etc. ce qui fait croire que c'est une addition de quelqu'un, qui vouloit rendre, par une fraude pieuse, le martyre de S. Polycarpe plus merveilleux.* [Perhaps the true emendation is *περὶ στερνὰ*, which is effected by the insertion of a single letter.—EDIT.]

⁴ Περὶ Στεφ. iii. 161.

⁵ Euseb. vi. 29.

In the fourth century, Ephraim Syrus went to Cæsarea, to visit Basil, and to hear him preach, and saw a dove, white as snow, and bright as the sun, sitting upon Basil's shoulder, and whispering to him what he should say.⁶ These prodigies were borrowed partly from Pagan prodigies and auguries; and partly from some passages in the Gospels, to which Christians ought to have paid more reverence, and not to have made this imprudent and impertinent use of them.

It seems probable upon the whole (for in points of this kind there is no such thing as certainty) that the writer of the Epistle did not mention the *dove*. It is impossible to determine whether Eusebius found *περιστερὰ* in his copy or no; because, though he had seen it there, he might have dropped it on purpose, accounting it to be either a ridiculous miracle, or an interpolation. When he gives an account of the death of Herod Agrippa from Josephus, *αὐτοῖς γράμμασιν*, in the very words, he drops the *owl*, who, as Josephus says, appeared over the head of Agrippa; in which omission there is perhaps a little too much of the *finesse*. Mr. Whiston endeavours to vindicate Eusebius in this affair, and forces the *owl* upon him by the help of a conjecture. We are certain that this *bird* is in Josephus, but we have little reason to conclude that he ever was in Eusebius. One owl in the hand is worth two in the conjectural bush.⁷

After all, supposing that Eusebius suppressed the *dove*, I see no reason for *tragical outcries* that, by granting this, we must give him up as a writer of no integrity, and that all his credit is at an end. He had his defects, as well as other ancient writers, and some of those faults shall be taken notice of in their proper place. But in the case before us, it may be said, he had no mind to expose Christianity to the scoffs of infidels, and himself at the same time, by recording such a silly contemptible tale; and, in such cases, *suppressions* are more allowable than *interpolations*. The latter are always unpardonable, the former may sometimes be excusable; for, as a critic, Eusebius might justly

⁶ See Tillemont, H. E. ix. 208.

⁷ See Euseb. H. E. ii. 10, and Joseph., *Ant.* xix. 8, and Mr. Whiston's translation and notes. Eusebius (i. 9.) cites Josephus as mentioning *Lysanias the Tetrarch*, for which Jos. Scaliger and Valesius blame him, and take it to be a wilful misrepresentation.

suspect that the passage was not genuine, and as an historian, he might not care to go out of his way, and give reasons for omitting it, since that was not the method of writing in ancient times.

Polycarp's prayer at the stake is such as one might expect from an holy martyr, and it is in few words. When he had finished it, and said *Amen*, they set fire to the pile. Ἀναπέμψαντος αὐτοῦ τὸ Ἀμήν κ. τ. λ. Valesius: *Verbum ἀναπέμψαντος hoc mihi indicare videtur, ipsam quidem orationem tacite ac submissa voce a Polycarpo pronunciatam fuisse; Amen vero edita voce prolatum.* Clericus *Hist. Eccl.* p. 728: *Non potuissent preces ab iis, qui aderant, Christianis audiri, et aliis referri, si submissa voce eas fudisset Polycarpus. Quod miror Valesium ad animum non revo-* casse. The observation of Valesius is indeed neither judicious nor worthy of him; nor will the word ἀναπέμπειν, joined to *Amen*, take it as you will, prove that *the prayer* was uttered in a low voice. It should be translated simply, *Et postquam Amen pronunciasset, or emisisset.*

When the proconsul exhorted Polycarp to comply, and to repent, and to say, Αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους, *Away with the impious*, the Saint, looking severely on the multitude, and sighing, said, *Away with the impious.* This, in the sense in which Polycarp must be supposed to have meant it, has been thought too uncharitable, and therefore a forgery of the writer; yet, candidly interpreted, it may mean no more than this, *May true religion flourish and impiety cease!* Some perhaps will be of opinion that this apostolical Father spake *prophetically* to the wicked and persecuting Jews and Gentiles of Smyrna, who stood round him, impatient to destroy him; for not long after his martyrdom, the city of Smyrna was overturned by a very violent earthquake (A.D. 177), in which many of them may be supposed to have perished.⁸

When Polycarp was urged by the proconsul to renounce Christ, he replied, *These eighty-six years do I serve him, &c.* Hence some have concluded that he was just so many years old. S. Basnage is of another opinion, and says that Polycarp meant, he had been so many years a bishop. Irenæus also represents him as *extremely and uncommonly old*:—ἐπιπολὺ γὰρ παρέμεινε, καὶ

⁸ Dio, l. lxxi. ; Aristides Orat. 20, 21, 22, 41.

πάνν γέραλεος. Hence Basnage concludes that he was about one hundred and twenty years old when he died.⁹ I think we may suppose that the *eighty-six years*, mentioned by Polycarp, were neither those of his life, nor those of his episcopal function, but of his being a Christian; and then, if he was converted at fourteen, he would be a hundred years old at his death. Many other persons have arrived to that age, and amongst Gruter's inscriptions is this: MEMORIAE. SEX. VIGELLII. AQVINAT. QVI. ANNVM. ATTIGIT. CENTES. SED. ALTERVM. ET. NONAG. PERPET. INOFFENSA. VALETVD. EXEGIT.

Polycarp says to the *Philippians* (in the old Latin version of his *Epistle*, which supplies the defect of the Greek copy), *De vobis enim gloriatur [Paulus] in omnibus Ecclesiis, quæ Deum solæ tunc cognoverant: nos autem nondum noveramus.* Basnage, who, with Usher, thinks that Polycarp means himself by nos, makes this an argument for his great length of life; but it is not evident that Polycarp speaks of himself: he may mean the Christians of Smyrna, as Cotelierius observes. Tillemont places his death A.D. 166.¹ S. Basnage dates it 169.² When they would have fastened him with nails to the stake, he desired them to desist. *He for whom I suffer, said he, will enable me to stand still, and not to fly from the fire:*³ nor did his resolution fail him.

⁹ Annal. i. p. 792.

¹ See Hist. Eccl. ii. p. 635, &c.

² The date of Polycarp's martyrdom, in truth, is not easily determined; for the only existing chronological datum is so vague in its reference, that nothing certain can be built upon it. Pearson supposes that he suffered in the year 148, under *Antoninus Pius*; but Eusebius and Jerome agree in assigning the event to the reign of Marcus. At all events, it is clear that his episcopate extended considerably into the second century.—EDIT.

³ The Epistle of the Church of Smyrna says of the martyrs, τὸ πῦρ ἦν αὐτοῖς ψυχρὸν τὸ τῶν ἀπηνῶν βασανιστῶν. The passage, which has been misunderstood, relates to the torments inflicted on the martyrs, before they were put to death. They were treated like slaves and criminals, and tortured; and in such tortures, fire was usually one instrument. Q. Curtius (vi. 11) says of Philotas: *Ac primo quamquam hinc ignis, illinc verbera, jam non ad quæstionem, sed ad pœnam ingerebantur.* Cic. in Verr. v. 63: *Huccine tandem omnia reciderunt, ut civis Romanus, deligatus in foro, virgis cæderetur? Quid, cum ignes, ardentesque laminæ, cæterique cruciatus admovebantur?* Seneca says of the emperor Caius (De Ira, iii. 19): *Ceciderat flagellis senatores; ipse effecit ut dici possit, Solet fieri: torserat per omnia, quæ in rerum natura tristissima sunt, fidiculis, tabularibus, eculeo, igne, vultu suo. Et hoc loco respondebitur, Magnam rem! si tres senatores, quasi nequam mancipia, inter verbera et flammæ divisit.* De Brev. Vit. 18: *Saxa, ferrum, ignem, Caium excepturi.* Suetonius, Domit. 10. [Domitianus] plerosque partis adversæ novo quæstionis genere distorsit: immisso per

The miracles at his martyrdom are of the dubious and suspicious kind, and it is *possible* that the Epistle itself, which contains them, might have passed through the hands of interpolators before it came into those of Eusebius. That he suffered martyrdom is unquestionable. Besides many other testimonies, we have that of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, in the second century, who says, Πολύκαρπος ὁ ἐν Σμύρνῃ καὶ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ μάρτυς.⁴

If any one imagines the relation made by the Church of Smyrna on this occasion to be just and faithful, he has a right to believe it. I think so too; and I add, that we have no right to insult him for being of that opinion. But let others also be permitted to suspend their assent.

Whatsoever we determine concerning the wonders, the behaviour of Polycarp, and of his contemporaries and fellow Christians, teaches us to determine that God was with them, and assisted them. The sufferings of the Christians afforded examples of courage and constancy which seemed more than

obsœna igne. Cicero, Topic. 20 : Facit etiam necessitas fidem, quæ cum a corporibus, tum ab animis nascitur. Nam et verberibus, tormentis, igni fatigati, quæ dicunt, ea videtur veritas ipsa dicere. Propertius, i. i. 27 : Fortiter et ferrum, sævos patiemur et ignes : Sit modo libertas, quæ volet ira, loqui. iv. 7. 43 : Lygdamus uratur, candescat lamina vernæ. Tibullus, i. 10. 21 : Ure meum potius flamma caput, et pete ferro Corpus, et intorto verberare terga seca. Horace, Epist. i. 15. 36 : Scilicet ut ventres lamina candente nepotum Diceret urendos. Juvenal, xiv. : Tum felix, quoties aliquis, tortore vocato, Uritur ardenti propter duo lintea ferro. Ovid. Met. iii. 696 : Et dum crudelia jussæ Instrumenta necis, ferrumque ignisque, parantur. Seneca, Œdip. 862 : Huc aliquis ignem : flamma jam excutiet fidem. Petronius : In verba Eumolpi sacramentum juravimus, uri, vinciri, verberari, ferroque necari ; et quicquid aliud Eumolpus jussisset, tanquam legitimi gladiatores domino, corpora animosque religiosissime addicimus. Seneca, Epist. xxxvii. : Eadem honestissimi hujus, et illius turpissimi auctoramenti verba sunt, uri, vinciri, ferroque necari. Ab illis qui manus arenæ locant, et edunt ac bibunt quæ per sanguinem reddant, cavetur ut ista vel inviti patiantur : a te, ut volens libensque. Epist. vii. : Occide, ure, verbera. Quare tam timide incurrit in ferrum ? Quinctilian, Declam. ix. : Fremebant ubique omnia apparatu mortis. Hic ferrum acuebat, ille accendebat ignibus laminas : hinc virgæ, inde flagella adferebantur. Tertullian, Apol. c. 15 : Risimus et inter ludicras meridianorum crudelitates, Mercurium mortuos cauterio examinantem. Ignatius, Epist. ad Rom. c. 5 : Πῦρ, καὶ σταυρὸς, θηρίων τε συστάσεις, ἀνατομαί, διαιρέσεις, σκορπισμοὶ ὀστέων, συγκοπαὶ μελῶν, ἀλεσμοὶ ὅλου τοῦ σώματος, καὶ κόλασις τοῦ Διαβόλου ἐπ' ἐμὲ ἐρχέσθω, μόνον ἵνα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιτύχω. Justin. M. Dial. c. 110. Κεφαλοτομούμενοι γὰρ καὶ σταυρούμενοι, καὶ θηρίοις παραβαλλόμενοι, καὶ δεσμοῖς, καὶ πυρὶ, καὶ πάσαις ταῖς ἄλλαις βασάνοις, ὅτι οὐκ ἀφιστάμεθα τῆς ὁμολογίας, δῆλόν ἐστιν.

⁴ Apud Euseb. H. E. v. 24.

⁵ Two previous Questions, &c. p. 31.

human, and had a happy effect in converting others. We have authentic accounts of many persons, in the bloom of life, and of the infirmer sex, who received the sentence of condemnation to a ⁶ cruel death without consternation, and underwent it without a complaint, and sometimes with exultation and joy. When we read that Arria gave her husband the sword from her bleeding breast, with, *My dear, it is nothing*, we admire the deed, and the speech. In the Pagan lady such resolution is heroism; in the Christian what is it less?

The persecution, which the Christians endured, was the completion of Christ's predictions; the fortitude, with which they endured it, was the completion of his promises. He bequeathed calamities and sufferings to them as a legacy, and he commanded them to die for his sake, (a command hard to flesh and blood!) but he promised that he would be with them, and make his abode in them, and be their strength and support, when all things else should fail and forsake them.

Many were the motives which concurred to animate the ancient Christians: motives, which might sometimes produce an excess of courage bordering upon rashness and enthusiasm; but, as the ⁷ love of life and the abhorrence of pain are universal passions, there seems wanting a cause as universal to overcome them in persons of all nations, ages, sexes, and conditions, and there is none which will operate uniformly, besides a ⁸ divine assistance; none to which we may more reasonably ascribe it, as to the leading and principal cause, since it suits so well with the predictions and the promises of Christ. Some will call the doctrine of divine assistance *fanaticism*; but let them remember that many wise Pagans held it, for they will perhaps hearken to a Platonist or a Stoic. To suppose that God takes no care

⁶ In Diocletian's persecution, the Pagans endeavoured to invent the most painful torments, to weary out the patience of the Christians, and to make them recant; and the pious Christians of later ages, who have presided over the Inquisition, have imitated the Pagans in all these cruelties, and used their best endeavours to surpass them in barbarity, and perhaps studied the Acts of the martyrs and the ecclesiastical historians for this purpose: though indeed Satan might inspire them, without such helps.

⁷ ——— *Qui mente novissimus exit,*

Lucis amor.

Statius.

⁸ Dodwell hath treated this subject very well in his dissertation, *De fortitudine Martyrum*.

of good men in the violent trials and distresses which they undergo for his sake, is entertaining a mean opinion of Providence. This divine favour was not confined to the three first centuries: it has been extended to multitudes who since that time have fallen innocent victims to anti-Christian tyranny, and have laid down their lives for their religion with as much constancy as the ancient Christians.

But it will be said, all Christian sects have had those whom they call *martyrs*; and shall we bestow that honourable appellation on the schismatical, or the erroneous? I see not how we can avoid it. If a person lays down his life for the name of Christ, or for what he takes to be the religion of Christ, when he might prolong his days by renouncing his faith, he must stand for a martyr in every reasonable man's calendar, though he may have been much mistaken in some of his opinions.⁹

⁹ "Unless *Driedo* had, unawares I think, acquainted me with the Provost of *Stenelda's* Epistle to *S. Bernard*, I had not known either your [*the Church of Rome's*] cruelty against the *Albigenses*, or *Picards*, as I suppose, or their constancy in suffering tortures in themselves most grievous, yet attended with usages as disgraceful; both for the manner or form of proceeding as injuriously inflicted, as the ground or matter of accusations brought against them were unjust and impious. The Provost's Epistle was to this effect:—

" 'I would gladly be resolved, holy father, might I enjoy your presence, whence it is that in heretics, the Devil's members, there should be so great resolution for defence of their heresies, as the like can scarce be found in very religious and faithful Christians. There are (saith he) amongst us, heretics which put no confidence in the suffrages of men deceased, or prayers of saints: fastings and other afflictions of the body usually undertaken for sin, are not in their opinion necessary to the righteous: Purgatory after death they acknowledge none: denying the making of our Lord's body in the sacrament of the altar: the Church they affirm to be amongst them, having neither fields nor possessions. Of such we have known divers, by the multitude, misled with too much zeal, violently haled against our will unto the flame; whose torments they not only endured with patience, but entertained with joy. I would therefore be resolved by you, holy father, whence so great resolution in the Devil's members should spring.' (*Driedo*, l. iv. de *Ecclesiæ Dogm. et Script.* c. 5.)

"No question but this Provost, which esteemed no better of them, than as of heretics, or Satan's members, did relate the worst opinions then known to be held by them: and yet he, as I would have the reader note, living in their time, lays no such odious tenets to their charge, as those that lived long after, or were employed by the Romish state to write against Wickliff, Huss, or Jerome of Prague, have charged them and their followers with. *Driedo* tells us, he finds no direct answer by way of epistle or writing unto this venerable man's demand in particular: but out of *S. Bernard's* doctrine elsewhere delivered concerning like heretics, he finds this resolution: *Nihil simile habet constantia martyrum, et pertinacia hæreticorum, quia in illis pietas, in istis duritia cordis contemptum mortis operatur*, The constancy

Mark, Bishop of Arethusa, a considerable man in the Arian, or rather in the semi-Arian party, endured cruel torments from the irritated pagans with astonishing bravery; and (besides Sozomen) Theodoret, and Gregory Nazianzen, though ¹ Athanasian bishops, have highly extolled him for it. He had escaped by flight; but, hearing that many Christians were in danger of suffering upon his account, he returned and surrendered himself, to deliver his brethren. Tillemont's distress on the constancy of this heretic is remarkable, and his diffidence well expressed. "This is what St. Gregory, Theodoret, and Sozomen have related concerning the fortitude of Mark of Arethusa. The fact is too well supported to admit of a doubt: but it is no small difficulty to know whether this fortitude was a virtue purely human, like that of the Reguli, the Scævolæ, and other heroes of Paganism, which in reality was only an effect of their pride; or whether it was a Christian virtue, a gift of the grace of our Lord, and an operation of that charity which maketh saints. For the foundation of true virtue is true faith, without which it is impossible to please God; as likewise it is impossible that true virtue should not please him. And history represents to us every where this prelate as engaged in the belief, in the faction, and in the intrigues of the Arians."² Mark had demolished a Pagan tem-

of martyrs hath no affinity with the stubbornness of heretics; piety breeds contempt of death in the one, hardness of heart in the other. (*Homil. 66, in Cant.*) Such good-minded men as S. Bernard, I think, had least to do in the examination of such men, most obnoxious to misinformation in the particulars of their carriage: with which the civil magistrates of France, though Romish Catholics, better acquainted, have given them laudable testimonies for their honest and religious lives: and whether these mentioned by that Provost were such as S. Bernard spake against, in the place last cited, is more than Driedo knew. Howsoever, in matters of this nature, it is most true, *Bernardus non vidit omnia.*" T. Jackson's *Works*, vol. i. p. 278.

¹ Chalcidius, a Christian philosopher, who did not admit the creation of matter, was an intimate friend of Hosius of Corduba. Bishops of learning, genius, and abilities (and such Hosius certainly was) did not quarrel with their friends for holding sentiments, which caused heretics to be condemned with so much rigour, and to be loaded with so many calumnies. All bishops did not resemble Father Epiphanius. But perhaps they were more tractable in civil and familiar commerce and conversation, than in Councils; where moderation was hardly ever known, after that of the Apostles. *Beausobre, Hist. de Manich. ii. 238.*

² H. Eccl. vii. 370. See also, in p. 726, the distress of Tillemont, Baronius, and Bollandus, on this grievous difficulty. They know not where to place Mark of Arethusa, whether among the *saints*, or among the *sinner*s, or in the *Intermundia* of the *Epicurean Gods*.

ple, in the reign of Constantius, and had built a church over its ruins; in doing which he seems to have showed more zeal than prudence: but this part of his conduct gives no pain to the Tillemonts and the Baroniuses. The best excuse that can be made for him is that he had the permission of the emperor for acting as he did, though even that excuse is scarcely satisfactory.³

Paul and Silas were severely beaten with rods, and then cast into a dungeon, and put in the stocks, which was a painful posture. At midnight, when such wounds and torments give the most uneasiness, instead of uttering sighs and groans, instead of praying to God to relieve them, they sang praises to him with a loud voice.⁴ Hence we conclude that they were assisted by God, who alleviated their pain, and gave them not only resignation and patience, but exultation and joy. When a martyr suffers greater torments than these for the same cause, and shows the same undaunted and cheerful spirit, is it not just to suppose that he receives the same assistances? The behaviour of the man, the honour of religion, the promise of Christ, the goodness of God, all lead us to this determination.

The far greater part of the *Martyrologies* is indeed so silly and contemptible, as to be beneath all notice and censure; and of those which are of a better stamp, some seem to have been drawn up by persons, who, through excessive veneration of the departed saints, and a love of the marvellous, or other motives, have inserted false embellishments; and then the transcribers have made interpolations of the same kind. The authors of pious frauds are foolish knaves, who do irreparable mischief to the cause which they want to recommend.

The copies which we have of the ancient *Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas* differ considerably⁵. “The African style of these Acts shows their antiquity; and they relate what Perpetua suffered in prison, and some of her dreams, written, if we may believe the author of the Acts, by herself, and also a dream of Saturus, who suffered at the same time. In the dream of Perpetua we see some beginnings of the opinion of *Purgatory*, and of praying for

³ See further, under the reign of *Julian*.—EDIT.

⁴ Acts xvi. 22.

⁵ *Plaustra mendaciorum* is the properest name for most of them. See some conjectures concerning the pious lies in the Legends, in Bayle's Dict. in v. VALERIUS.

⁶ See Tillemont, *H. E.* iii. 137, and Basnage, *Ann.* ii. p. 224.

those who are in it, as the commentators have not failed to observe. The question is whether they are really the words of *Perpetua*, of which it is impossible to be certain. These notions might indeed have been in some measure introduced amongst the common people, and *Perpetua* might have had a dream conformable to such current notions: but nothing obliges us to believe that all the dreams of martyrs were revelations, or that this in particular was of that kind.⁷ The behaviour of the martyrs related in those Acts, as it is circumstantial and probable, so is it affecting and edifying; but their visions and revelations seem to be partly of the enthusiastic kind, and such as might be expected from the disciples of Montanus. Perhaps the writer, who is supposed by many to have been a Montanist, and the transcribers, enlarged and adulterated that part of the account, either to propagate some favourite notions of their own, or to omit nothing that they had gathered from rumour and common report. This I am inclined to suppose, in respect and reverence for these holy martyrs; but what we much wish, we easily believe, and that perhaps may be my case. In some of the ancient Acts of the martyrs, and in ecclesiastical historians, we have well attested examples of heroic faith and fortitude, and of love stronger than death, which would affect even the coldest heart; and which Joseph Scaliger, a man of good taste, a clear judgment, and no superstition, could never read without being greatly moved⁸.

Justin Martyr, whilst he was a Pagan, concluded very candidly and reasonably, from the courage and constancy of the persecuted Christians, that they could not be profligate and debauched people; and his Pagan and Platonic judgment on this point was better than the ecclesiastical judgment of several Christian writers. Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ, τοῖς Πλάτωνος χαίρων διδάγμασι, διαβαλλομένους ἀκούων Χριστιανούς, ὁρῶν δὲ ἀφόβους πρὸς θάνατον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄλλα νομιζόμενα φοβερὰ, ἐνενόουν ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φιληδονίᾳ ὑπάρχειν αὐτούς.⁹

⁷ *Le Clerc*, Bibl. Chois. xxvi. 220.

⁸ *Eorum lectione piorum animus ita afficitur, ut nunquam satur inde recedat: quod quidem ita esse, unusquisque pro captu suo et conscientiae modo sentire potest. Certe ego nihil unquam in Historia Ecclesiastica vidi, a cujus lectione commotior recedam, ut non amplius meus esse videar.* Anim. in Euseb. p. 121.

⁹ *Apol. ii. c. 12.*

The Christians, that is, the wise and prudent part of them, were of opinion that, as it was their duty to suffer any torments rather than dissemble or deny their religion, so was it also to avoid persecution, and never to expose themselves uncalled to so hard a trial. Mention is made in the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna, and in other ancient records, of some rash and presumptuous Christians, who offered themselves to martyrdom; and who, when they were condemned, lost all courage and deserted their cause; whilst others, who had been diffident of themselves, and had retired, being discovered and seized, died in a most Christian manner. This also was perfectly suitable to our Saviour's doctrine and promises, who required humility and prudence from his disciples. Peter made bolder professions of fortitude and fidelity than any of the apostles, and therefore he alone fell away in the dark hour of temptation, and denied his master.

This wonderful behaviour of the ancient Christians may justly be accounted a proof of the truth of our religion, and we should deserve to be blamed and despised, if we parted with it, and gave it up tamely upon account of a few objections. Objections may be made even to demonstrations, and *Nihil est tam bonum, quin dicendo malum effici possit.*

The increase of Christianity under all these discouragements, and this cloud of afflictions, is another argument of the same kind, and a subject highly worthy of consideration. *Adeone levis res et futilis videtur Religio Christiana, aut tam vulgaris tamque similis rerum quotidianarum progressio ejus et propagatio, ut quemvis hominem (non jam Christianum dico, sed vel ab omni religione alienum, vel ab ea alienissimum) exquirere pudeat, quales homines essent, qua doctrina, quo ingenio, qua disputandi scientia, qua facultate dicendi instructi, qui gravibus illis et constantibus Romanis persuadere potuerint, relictis et repudiatis diis suis, quos se nunquam aut impune neglexisse, aut frustra gravissimis reipublicæ temporibus invocasse majores omnibus monumentis proclamabant et testabantur, hominum et barbarorum et a se devictorum et Judæorum deum, hominemque simul Judæum a popularibus suis paulo ante servili supplicio necatum, venerari; qui tot tamque dispares nationes, alias immanitate efferatas, alias moribus et disciplina inflatas, alias horrida quadam et agresti virtute*

*feroces, alias luxu et licentia petulantes, alias victoriis et imperio insolentes, alias diuturna servitute fractas et debilitatas, alias ignorantia et tarditate, alias doctrinæ et ingenii fama indociles, ita flexerint et mutaverint, ut religioni patriæ novam et externam, ut omni licentiæ libertatique vivendi (quicum prioribus fere religionibus summa pax et concordia fuit) vitam rigidam et severam et omnia voluptatis vel confinia anxie fugientem, virtutesque quarum ne nomina quidem antea audiverant, ut denique paupertatem divitiis, odium gratiæ, contemtionem honori, exilium patriæ, mortem vitæ anteferrent?*¹ These reflections are as just as they are elegant, and the inference which the reader ought to make from them is, that a change, so happy, so extensive, and so surprising, could have been effected by nothing less than the Divine will and assistance. *The progress of Christianity*, says Moyle, *considering its late rise, and the constant opposition it met with, is, even on my moderate computation, prodigious, and to be accounted for by nothing but the Divine Providence*².

The alteration also which Christianity made in the manners of men, and the stop which it put to polygamy, is very remarkable. Οὔτε οἱ ἐν Παρθίᾳ Χριστιανοὶ πολυγαμοῦσι, Πάρθοι ὑπάρχοντες· οὐχ οἱ ἐν Περσίδι γαμοῦσι τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν, Πέρσαι ὄντες· οὐ παρὰ Βάκτροις καὶ Γάλλοις φθείρουσι τοὺς γάμους· ἀλλ' ὅπου εἰσὶν, οὔτε ὑπὸ τῶν κακῶς κειμένων νόμων καὶ ἐθῶν νικῶνται.³ Thus, according to this ingenious philosopher, the Christians of all countries retained the good qualities, and rejected the reigning vices, of the several nations of which they were natives.

The acute author, Montaigne,⁴ is of opinion that Christianity,

¹ Thirlby, *Dedic. Just. M.*

² Thundering Legion, p. 327.

³ Bardesanes, *apud Euseb. Præp. Evang.* vi. 10, in his Discourse against Astrological Fate.

⁴ "The law which permits only one wife, is conformable to the nature of the European, but not to the nature of the Asiatic climate. It is for this reason that Mohammedism found so easy an admission in Asia, and such difficulty to extend itself in Europe; that Christianity hath maintained itself in Europe, and hath been destroyed in Asia; and that the Mohammedans have made so much, and the Christians so little, progress in China. In the time of Justinian, many philosophers, uneasy at the restraint laid upon them by Christian laws, retired into Persia, to Chosroës. What induced them most, says Agathias, was that polygamy was there permitted to men who did not abstain even from adultery. It is hardly possible that Christianity should ever be established in China. Vows of virginity, the assembling of women in churches, their necessary intercourse with the ministers of religion, their participation of the sacraments, auricular confession, extreme unction, the marrying but one

humanly speaking, can never get footing and ground in the eastern countries, the nature of the climate, the constitution and complexion of the inhabitants, and their temper and manners and laws being repugnant to some precepts of the Gospel. I ask then, How came it to pass that in the first and second centuries Christianity found admission and made a progress in those countries, notwithstanding these, and many other difficulties and impediments besides these? Must we not ascribe its success either to miracles wrought in its behalf, or to an extraordinary influence of the Spirit of God upon the minds of those who embraced it?⁵

6. Amongst the Apostolical writers some have placed the author of the EPISTLE to DIOGNETUS, which has been usually ascribed to *Justin Martyr*.⁶ Tillemont⁷ first declared that he was inclined for some reasons, to think it more ancient, and written before A. D. 70. He says also that a learned man, whom he names not, had been of that opinion. The last editor of Justin thinks that they are mistaken as to the antiquity of this Epistle, and is in doubt whether it should be ascribed to Justin, or no.⁸ *Baratier* gives it to *Clemens Romanus*, and Mr. Whiston to *Timothy*. In this Epistle there are many allusions to the New Testament, which Mr. Whiston has marked in the margin of his translation; and there is nothing said concerning any miraculous powers and gifts amongst Christians. It is *opus eximium et præstantissimum*, says the Benedictine editor; and Baratier and Mr. Whiston are of the same opinion. Diognetus, who is called *κράτιστος*, was, we may suppose, if he really existed, a man of some rank. His honour wanted to be informed of the nature of Christianity; and why this new religion was not made known sooner; and for what reasons the Christians exposed themselves to persecution and to death, neglecting the things of this world, and rejecting the religions of the Greeks and of the Jews. To these queries our author replies in a letter, in which the truth of Christianity is, in a manner, taken for granted, and nothing is urged that was proper to convince and convert an unbeliever; wife, all this oversets the manners and customs, and strikes at the religion and laws of the country." *L'Esprit des Loix*, xvi. 2, xvii. 6, xix. 18.

⁵ See *Discourse* iii. on the *Christ. Religion*.

⁶ See *Fabric. Bibl. Gr.* v. 58.

⁷ *Hist. Eccl.* ii. p. 493.

⁸ *Præf.* p. lxxiv.

so that Diognetus, if he had been morose and censorious, would have concluded, that this writer had found a new religion, but had lost something else. One would think that the apologist would have mentioned the prophecies of the Old Testament accomplished in Christ, the miracles of Christ and of his Apostles, and other proofs of the truth and importance of Christianity. Not at all. He begins with setting forth the folly of worshipping images, and thinking them to be real gods; and this he gives as the reason for which Christians rejected the religion of the Gentiles.

The Jews, says he, though they worship one God, yet offer him sacrifices; as if he stood in need of such gifts, and were to be fed with the steam of victims. They are also superstitious observers of the difference between food clean and unclean, of the Sabbath, of circumcision, fasts, feasts, new moons, &c. Therefore we Christians reject the Jewish religion. What he says on this head is not only too severe upon the Jews, but incautious, and injudicious; and, if it proved anything, would prove more than he intended, and was aware of, and bear hard upon the Mosaic Law. The same defect may be observed in some arguments of Arnobius upon the same subject.

Then he proceeds to observe that Christians were examples of all that was good, and patient under afflictions and ill-usage; that God sent his Son to suffer for men, to redeem, and to instruct them, who, before he came, knew not God, and who were grown very wicked; all which, if intended as a sufficient proof of Christianity, was little better than begging the question.

He speaks of the Jews, as if at that time they offered up sacrifices; whence some learned men have concluded that he wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem; but the argument is scarcely conclusive, especially when we consider what sort of a writer we have to do with. *Sacrificia quidem*, says the Benedictine,⁹ *Judæi offerre desierunt post urbis et templi excidia. Sed tamen cum auctor epistolæ quid intersit Judæos inter et Christianos exponat, non immerito in Judæis aspernatur cruenta illa animalium sacrificia, quæ et Judaici cultus pars erant insignis, et sibi per vim erepta Judæi, si minus usu, saltem animo et voluntate*

⁹ Præf. p. lxxv.

retinebant. Pluribus aliis contigit Judæos eodem modo exagitare. S. Phileas Martyr de Judæis sic loquitur :—“ Solis Judæis præceptum fuerat sacrificare Deo soli in Jerosolyma. Nunc autem peccant Judæi in locis aliis solemnia sua celebrantes, &c.

I cannot believe that this Epistle was written by Justin Martyr; for Justin would have managed the argument better, and have omitted neither the prophecies, nor the miracles. The author seems to have been some Gentile converted to Christianity, who had perused Justin's *Cohortatio ad Græcos*.² Justin begins it thus :—Ἀρχόμενος τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς παραινέσεως, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἕλληνες, εὐχομαι τῷ Θεῷ ἐμοὶ μὲν ὑπάρξαι, τὰ δέοντα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰπεῖν· ὑμᾶς δὲ, τῆς προτέρας ἀφεμένους φιλονεικίας, καὶ τῆς τῶν προγόνων πλάνης ἀπαλλαγέντας, ἐλέσθαι τὰ λυσιτελοῦντα νυνί. This is an imitation of the *exordium* in the oration of *Demosthenes* for *Ctesiphon*; and as Justin imitates *Demosthenes*, so the writer of the Epistle imitates Justin :—Παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ καὶ τὸ λέγειν καὶ τὸ ἀκούειν ἡμῖν χωρηγοῦντος, αἰτοῦμαι δοθῆναι, ἐμοὶ μὲν εἰπεῖν οὕτως, ὥς μάλιστα ἂν ἀκούσαι [ἀκούσαντά] σε βελτίω γενέσθαι· σοί τε [δὲ] οὕτως ἀκούσαι, ὥς μὴ λυπηθῆναι τὸν εἰπόντα. This is said well enough : *amphora cæpit Institui; currente rota, cur urceus exit?*

This Epistle has a few chasms, but there seems to be only a little of it that is lost. It was perhaps an exercise, or declamation, addressed to a great man, with whom the author had no acquaintance; as some modern Epistles to the Pope, and to Lewis the Fourteenth, which were never presented.

As I have had occasion to mention Tillemont, and shall probably often cite him hereafter, I take this opportunity to own

¹ Act. Mart. p. 444.

² The style of the *Epistle to Diognetus* is so widely different from that of the acknowledged works of Justin, that it cannot, with a shadow of probability, be included among them. It is not mentioned by Eusebius or Jerome; its quotations from the New Testament are more direct than is usual with Justin; it is more spirited in style and more elegant in diction, and unquestionably the production, whatever may have been Dr. Jortin's opinion, of no inconsiderable writer. The main object of the author was the conversion of *Diognetus* from Paganism to Christianity; and, with this view, the constancy and fortitude of Christians under persecution are set forth in the most glowing colours, as a convincing argument of the purity of their faith. As they were still in a suffering condition, a later date than the time of Constantine is impossible; but the letter was certainly written long after the fall of Jerusalem. It has been attributed to Clement, but without an atom of proof, or even of plausibility.—EDIT.

my obligations to him for his useful and laborious collections. After this due respect and acknowledgment, I hope it will be permitted to make a few observations which may do others some good, and can now do him no harm, nor destroy the peace which I believe he enjoys in a better world. His History of the Emperors is very valuable; but he has filled his other books with an account of trifling, absurd, ridiculous miracles. He never affirms facts without vouchers, but he often makes use of bad ones in his Ecclesiastical History, and builds upon a sandy foundation, upon the testimony of forgers, fanatics, and of interested persons, who write in their own behalf, and want to discredit their adversaries. He commonly proceeds upon a supposition that they who have obtained the honour of *Ecclesiastical knighthood*, and are called *saints*, are all excellent men, and entirely to be trusted, and that all they who were, or were accounted *heterodox*, are to be little regarded, and held in bad esteem. He seems to have been a pious, humble, meek and modest, as well as a very learned and accurate man; and yet he cannot forbear insulting Protestant writers as heretics, even those to whom he and the Christian world had great obligations, as Usher, Pearson, &c. He takes all opportunities, and sometimes goes out of his way to seek opportunities of inculcating the horrible doctrine that the very best of Pagans, heretics, and schismatics are condemned to suffer eternal tortures. Speaking of young Tiberius, who was murdered by order of the Emperor Caius, and compelled by the soldiers, as Philo relates it, to thrust a sword into his own body, he concludes the melancholy tale with this reflection:—*Thus by his own hand he ended his miserable life, to begin another, the misery of which will never end.*³ Observe that this unhappy youth was then but nineteen years of age; that he had been bred up at court under Tiberius, in a sort of genteel prison; that probably he had never heard Christianity even mentioned; and that history relates no one bad thing concerning him: so that the Pagan ignorance of this poor child was altogether invincible, and might have been thought sufficient to qualify him at least for Purgatory. *Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum!* It is remarkable that in the little edition of Tillemont, the passage ends thus, *he ended his miserable*

³ Hist. des Emp. i. p. 142.

life. What follows was added afterwards in the *Quarto edition*: whence we may learn that the good man, as he grew older, grew more uncharitable in his religious notions. The apophthegm of Horace is not always true, *Lenit albescens animos capillus*. The hoary heads of some persons are like mount *Ætna*, where the snow and the fire dwell together in strict friendship.

Sed, quamvis nimio fervens exuberet æstu,
Scit nivibus servare fidem.¹

These are some of the doctrines which have unhappily helped to propagate atheism or deism, and have made many a man say to himself, *If this be Christianity, let my soul be with the philosophers*. The old Christians were more charitable, and had nobler sentiments of the Divine benignity. Justin Martyr⁵ speaks handsomely of Socrates and of other worthy men in the Pagan world, and represents them as a sort of Christians, and doubtless entertained favourable thoughts of their future state. Τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτότοκον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι ἐδιδάχθημεν, καὶ προεμηνύσαμεν λόγον ὄντα, οὗ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μετέσχε. Καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες, Χριστιανοὶ εἰσι, καὶ ἄθεοι ἐνομίσθησαν, οἷον ἐν Ἑλληνισμῷ Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος, καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς. Ὡστε καὶ οἱ προγενόμενοι ἄνευ λόγου βιώσαντες, ἄχρηστοι καὶ ἐχθροὶ τῷ Χριστῷ ᾗσαν, καὶ φονεῖς τῶν μετὰ λόγου βιούντων· οἱ δὲ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες καὶ βιούντες, Χριστιανοὶ καὶ ἄφοβοι καὶ ἀτάραχοι ὑπάρχουσι. Now turn to the Preface, and see the Benedictine editor⁶ fighting for a theological system which has nothing at all to do with an edition of Justin, and taking great pains to clear the good Father from the shameful imputation of supposing that a virtuous Pagan might be saved, as well as a monk.⁷ What will the Benedictine say for Clemens Alexandrinus? This learned and good-natured Father was of opinion that Christ and his apostles preached the gospel in *Hades* to the dead, and that the souls which repented and believed were received to favour:— ἐπεὶ σωτήριοι καὶ παιδευτικαὶ αἱ⁸ κολάσεις τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰς ἐπιστροφὴν

⁴ Claudian. Rapt. Pros. i. 165.

⁵ In his Apology, i. c. 46.

⁶ Ed. Paris. 1742. p. xxxii.

⁷ See Bishop Kaye's view of the passage, in his *Account of the Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr*, p. 68.—EDIT.

⁸ Aristotle says, Διαφέρει δὲ τιμωρία καὶ κόλασις· ἡ μὲν γὰρ κόλασις τοῦ πάσχοντος ἐνεκά ἐστιν, ἡ δὲ τιμωρία τοῦ ποιούντος. In Xenophon. *Æcon.* terra κολάζεται, i.e.

ἀγουσαι, καὶ τὴν μετάνοιαν τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν θάνατον αἰρούμεναι· καὶ ταῦτα καθαρώτερον διορᾶν δυναμένων τῶν σωμάτων ἀπηλλαγμένων ψυχῶν, καὶ πάθουσιν ἐπισκοτῶνται, διὰ τὸ μηκέτι ΕΠΙΠΡΟΣΘΕΣΘΑΙ σαρκίῳ.⁹ I think it should be ἐπιπροσθεῖσθαι σαρκίῳ, *obnubilari*, from ἐπιπροσθέω. *For the corrections of God are salutary, and instructive, leading to amendment, and preferring the repentance to the death of a sinner; and souls in their separate state, though obumbrated with perturbations, yet have a clearer discernment, than they had whilst they were in the body, as they are no longer clouded and encumbered with the flesh.*

7. Contemporary with Ignatius (A.D. 107) was PAPIAS, Bishop of Hierapolis, the Father of Traditions, and a man of small judgment,¹ who wrote an Exposition of the discourses of Christ.

emendatur. See A. Gellius. vi. 14. Clemens *Strom.* vii. p. 895, Θεὸς δὲ οὐ τιμωρεῖται. Ἔστι γὰρ ἡ τιμωρία, κακοῦ ἀνταπόδοσις· κολάζει μέντοι πρὸς τὸ χρήσιμον καὶ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίᾳ τοῖς κολαζομένοις. Origen was of the same opinion, and perhaps carried it somewhat farther.

⁹ *Strom.* vi. p. 764. See also p. 794, and the notes.

¹ The estimate which Jortin has here formed of Papias is derived from Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39); but the historian is there speaking of certain opinions which this Father had advocated respecting the Millennium. He observes that “amongst certain parables and discourses of the Saviour, and other traditions apparently fabulous, Papias maintained that, after the general resurrection of the dead, Christ would reign bodily upon the earth during a period of 1000 years;” and adds, that “he seems to have mistaken the mystical allusions of the Apostles, σφόδρα σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν. But although, in this particular case, he unquestionably betrayed a singular want of judgment, it does not appear that his attainments were, on that account, to be generally underrated. Indeed, Eusebius speaks of him in another place, and that within a few pages backward (iii. 36), as a man of considerable eloquence, and well acquainted with the Scriptures: ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα ὅτι μάλιστα λογέτατος, καὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰδήμων. If it be alleged that this encomium has been rejected as an interpolation, still the judgment which it delivers is fully borne out by the testimony of Jerome, in his Epistle to Licinius, from which it is also manifest that his “Exposition of Our Lord’s Discourses,” was still extant and duly appreciated in the time of that Father. *Sanctorum Papiæ et Polycarpi volumina*, he writes, *falsus ad te rumor pertulit a me esse translata; quia nec otii mei, nec virium est, tantas res eadem in alteram linguam exprimere venustate.* As to the fact of his treasuring up the traditionary instructions and records of our Lord and his Apostles, of which, it may be inferred from the conclusion of St. John’s Gospel, that there were many unrecorded by the sacred penmen, the result of such a zeal could not but be highly interesting and valuable. It is but justice to give the passage referred to in the text, in the words of the author (ap. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39):—Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς τὰ πολλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον, ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοί, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰ ληθὴ διδάσκουσιν· οὐδὲ τοῖς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐντολὰς μνημονεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τὰς παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τῇ πίστει δεδομένας, καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς παραγινομένας τῆς ἀληθείας. Εἰ δέ που καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς

He was extremely diligent in inquiring *what the Ancients, what Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, and the rest of the Lord's Disciples had said or taught.*

Mr. Whiston has somewhere observed, that Papias takes no notice of *Paul*, and therefore probably was of the sect of the *Ebionites*, who hated that Apostle. His remark is, like many other of his remarks, ingenious; and Papias is said to have made use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which was received by the Ebionites.² But yet, in behalf of poor Papias, whom one would rather rank among the *simpletons* than amongst the *heretics*, it might be urged, that, as his design was to collect all the *unwritten* sayings and actions of Christ, he thought that nothing of that kind could be learned from St. Paul, who had not conversed with the Lord, as Peter, Matthew, and others. And, indeed, it is scarcely conceivable how Papias could reverence St. John, and yet be an Ebionite; since the Gospel of that Apostle is so directly against the notions of the Ebionites.

8. A.D. 116. We have an Epistle of *Tiberianus*, governor of part of Palæstine, and called *Palæstinæ primæ Præses*, to Trajan; in which he speaks of the invincible obstinacy of the Galilæans, or Christians, under his jurisdiction, with punishing and de-

τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας, ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν, ἢ τί Φίλιππος, ἢ τί Θωμᾶς, ἢ Ἰάκωβος, ἢ τί Ἰωάννης, ἢ Ματθαῖος, ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν· ἅτε Ἀριστέων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης, οἱ τοῦ Κυρίου μαθηταί, λέγουσιν. Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσοῦτόν με ὠφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον, ὅσον τὰ παρὰ ζώσης φωνῆς καὶ μενούσης. In an old comment on the second chapter of the Apocalypse, Papias is affirmed to have been Bishop of *Pergamus*, and a conjecture is added that he was the angel of that Church, to which an epistle is there directed to be sent. Both the affirmation, however, and the conjecture, are set aside by the consent of antiquity, which is unanimous in fixing him in the see of Hierapolis in Phrygia. The time at which he flourished cannot be accurately ascertained, and chronologists vary between the years 107 and 116. There is more than one tradition of his martyrdom; but, as Eusebius and Jerome are alike silent on the subject, it is more probable that he died a natural death. A few unimportant fragments of his works are preserved in Grabe's *Spicilegium*, and Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*. That he favoured the Ebionites is a mere conjecture, which Jortin, though he is undeservedly severe upon this writer, is forced in candour to dismiss. His great error consisted in his *millennial* views; and with him, indeed, that obscure doctrine may be said to have originated. During the two first centuries it attained little notoriety even among the learned; and its subsequent reception by Irenæus and others is attributed to the early age at which its first promulgator lived. They adopted the notion, he observes, τὴν ἀρχαιότητα τὰνδρὸς προβεβλημένοι.—EDIT.

² Euseb.

stroying whom he declares himself quite tired. Pearson³ and some late writers, and Dr. Middleton also, treat this Epistle as genuine; which is an oversight: since there are so many reasons to think it spurious, as Dodwell has shewed.⁴ We have it only from Suidas and Malela, two sorry vouchers; and Eusebius knew nothing of it.⁵ So I hope we shall hear no more of it henceforward, either for or against the behaviour of the martyrs.

XIII.—ON THE APOLOGISTS AND THEIR WRITINGS.

QUADRATUS and ARISTIDES wrote Apologies⁶ for the Christian religion, and addressed and delivered them to Adrian, A.D. 126.

³ In his *Vindic. Ignat.*

⁴ *Dissert. Cypr.* xi. p. 244.

⁵ See Middleton, *Inquiry*, p. 201; S. Basnage, *Annal.* ii. p. 38; and particularly Tillemont, who fairly gives it up, and informs us that Valesius accounted it the work of a *blockhead* and an *impostor*. *Eccl. Hist.* ii. pp. 170, 571. Le Clerc also, though he lets it pass uncensured in his *Apostolical Fathers* (ii. p. 181), rejects it, where he gives an account of that edition: *Il y a — une Rélation supposée de Tiberien, Gouverneur de la première Palestine, à Trajan.* Bibl. A. et M. xxi. 304.

⁶ The *Apologies for Christianity* were perhaps the most valuable productions of the early Fathers; and there is a candour and sincerity about them, which could not fail to challenge investigation, and bring the principles and practice of believers into favourable notice. Acting, at first, on the defensive, they must have tended greatly to disarm the powers of persecution; and, gradually increasing from the humble appeal to justice into the voluminous and argumentative exposition of the follies, immoralities, and dangers of Paganism, they contributed effectually to the demolition of a system, based on the strength of ages, upheld by philosophic subtilty, and maintained by the prejudices of the people. QUADRATUS, the earliest of these advocates, was an Athenian, if not by birth, at least by education; and contemporary, though perhaps the more advanced in age, with *Clement of Rome* and *Papias*. He had received the benefit of Apostolical instruction; he was one of those favoured individuals who, in the infancy of the Gospel, were endowed with the *gift of prophecy*; he had conversed with some of those who had been the objects of our blessed Lord's most astonishing miracles; and his Apology is described as exhibiting *λαμπρὰ τεκμήρια τῆς τε τοῦ ἀνδρὸς διανοίας, καὶ τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς ὀρθότητος*. See Euseb. H. E. iii. 37; iv. 3. It had the immediate effect of producing the rescript addressed to Minutius Fundanus, mentioned below; which, with all its obscurity, put an end to that indiscriminate persecution of the Christians, to which Adrian's presence in Athens had given rise. Some have supposed that Quadratus was Bishop of Athens; others that he was the Apocalyptic angel of the Church of Philadelphia. The former opinion is at least doubtful; the latter decidedly incorrect. One short fragment of the Apology is all that now remains: and it is a valuable and important testimony to the truth and reality of the miracles of Christ. Jortin quotes it at length, when speaking of *Irenæus*. In conjunction with Quadratus, Eusebius and Jerome commonly mention his contemporary *Aristides*, who was an Athenian philosopher of considerable talents, and continued, even after his conversion to Christianity, to wear the peculiar dress of the schools. His Apology

So Eusebius and Jerome inform us.⁷ Unfortunately these Apologies are lost. If they could be retrieved, even at the expense of some homilies and creeds and controversial writings of the fourth and fifth centuries, it would be a cheap bargain.

It is not to be imagined that all the works of this kind, which were addressed to the Emperors, were presented by the authors; or that books in those days were as much spread and as well known as they are now, since the art of printing: and yet the genteel civility and decency and politeness, which is so observable in the Apology of⁸ Athenagoras, and in that of

was still in existence in the time of Eusebius, and is said to have been written with great learning, to have formed the model of those which Justin afterwards addressed to the Antonines. A French writer some time since affirmed that he had met with a copy in a library attached to a monastery at Athens; but all search for it has hitherto proved fruitless. Its recovery, so earnestly desired by Grabe, would indeed be a valuable addition to the treasures of Patristical Theology.—EDIT.

⁷ See Tillemont H. E. ii. p. 232.—Euseb. iv. 3, τούτῳ Κοδράτος λόγον προσφωνήσας ἀναδίδωσιν, ἀπολογία συντάξας καὶ Ἀριστείδης, ἀπολογία ἐπιφωνήσας Ἀδριανῷ, καταλέλοιπε. Hieron. Ep. 84, *Quadratus—nonne Adriano Eleusinae sacra invisenti librum pro nostra religione tradidit, et tantæ admirationi omnibus fuit, ut persecutionem gravissimam illius excellens sedaret ingenium?* Προσφωνεῖν is to dedicate a book; which may indeed be done without presenting it. Τοσαῦτα βιβλία γράψας, οὐδενὶ τῶν βασιλέων προσεφώνησε, says Diogenes Laertius of Chrysippus. *Some of the Pagan philosophers dedicated some of their books to Origen*, says Eusebius (vi. 19.):—ποτέ μὲν αὐτῷ προσφωνούντων τοὺς ἑαυτῶν λόγους. See also Euseb. vii. 20.

⁸ Tertullian, compared to these two Fathers, in point of address and courtesy, is a very clown: and so is Justin Martyr. [Of *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, and of *Melito*, an account is given hereafter. With respect to *Athenagoras*, there are two treatises still extant which bear his name; one, a *Legation* or *Apology for the Christians*; the other, a treatise on the *Resurrection of the dead*. Of their author little is known beyond the age in which he flourished; and his name and designation, as set forth in their titles. Like Aristides, he was a philosopher of Athens; and Philip Sidetes, a writer of the fifth century, gives a particular account of him; but it is clearly incorrect in one of its statements, and little reliance can be placed on it. It may or may not be true that the perusal of the Scriptures, with a view to the composition of a work against believers, effected his conversion from heathenism to Christianity; and that he became president of the Catechetical School at Alexandria, and was the master of Clement, who wrote the *Stromata*. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome make any mention of him; and hence some critics have been disposed to regard his *Πρεσβεία* as a third Apology of Justin, though the difference of title is alone sufficient to distinguish the two writers. A question has arisen concerning the individuals to whom the appeal was made; some supposing that Lucius Verus, the brother, and others that Lucius Commodus, the son of Antoninus, are joined with him in the inscription; but it is abundantly proved from the Apology itself (c. 15), that the father and son were the joint subjects of the address. Now Commodus, having been raised to the pro-consular authority in A.D. 176, was elevated to the full

Melito (of which a fragment is preserved in Eusebius), seems to imply that they had a design to offer them, or that they expected to have them perused by the Emperor.*

It is, indeed, not at all improbable, that Quadratus and Aristides delivered their Apologies into Adrian's hand, or at least that those Apologies were seen by him; for besides the testimonies of Eusebius and Jerome, which favour that opinion, it is to be observed that Adrian is represented in history as one whose knowledge was various and extensive, and who was excessively curious and inquisitive.¹ He had studied all magical arts; he had been initiated into Pagan mysteries; and he must have been inclined to know the true nature of Christianity, and to see what the learned of that sect had to say for themselves. Julian, in his *Cæsars*, banters Adrian for his pragmatistical disposition; little thinking that he was drawing his own picture,

imperial dignity in the year following; so that Tillemont and Lardner are, in all probability, correct in fixing the date of the Apology to the year 177, or a little later.

The *Legation* opens with a complaint that, while all other subjects of the empire performed their religious ceremonies without molestation, the mere name of Christian exposed the professors of the gospel to the most severe and unmerited persecution; and, praying for the infliction of punishment upon convicted offenders, denounces the injustice of condemning Christians alone, unheard, for crimes of which they were innocent. It then proceeds to the refutation of the three specific charges commonly alleged against the brethren, who were stigmatised as *Atheists*, as *Cannibals*, and as given to *incestuous* practices; and concludes with an elegant peroration, maintaining the Christian duty of submission to governors, and conciliating the imperial favour and protection. The style in which it is written is purely Attic, and formed with a degree of studied elegance, and all the ornaments of composition: the figures are bold and well-sustained, and the construction easy. Occasionally the arguments are somewhat obscure; but in his appeals to the justice and common sense of the philosophic Antonine, the commanding eloquence of the apologist breaks forth in an elegant simplicity of diction, which together are absolutely irresistible. With respect to doctrine, it has been urged that Athenagoras sanctions the worship of angels (cc. 10, 24); but, fairly interpreted, his words will be found to bear no such import. Throughout, indeed, his teaching is in strict conformity with the pure and spiritual precepts of the gospel of Christ.—EDIT.]

⁹ See Fabricius *Bibl. Gr.* v. 36; and Bayle's *Dict.* in v. ATHENAGORAS. S. Basnage, *Annal.* ii. p. 161, *Præsentem sane Cæsaribus fuisse Athenagoram, verba deprecantis ostendunt*: Ὑμεῖς δὲ, ὧ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι φύσει καὶ παιδείᾳ χρηστοὶ καὶ μέτριοι καὶ φιλόφρωνες, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἄξιοι, διαλελυμένῳ μὲν τὰ ἐγκλήματα τὴν βασιλικὴν κεφαλὴν ἐπινέυσατε. A weak argument to prove that Athenagoras pronounced his Apology before the Emperor! If Basnage had thought twice upon it, he would have blotted it out.

¹ Tertullian, *Apol.* c. 5. *Curiositatum omnium exploratur.*

and not considering that he was just such another as Adrian in many respects.

There was then no edict or law, which particularly forbade Christians to write in their own defence, or to read this or that book. Justin Martyr was probably mistaken in some of his assertions on this point, as Le Clerc observes.² The last editor of Justin takes under consideration, but he has hardly given a satisfactory account of it, or removed the difficulties.³ If there had been any danger in presenting an apology to Adrian, yet every one, who knows Ecclesiastical History, must know that the Christians of those times were men, whom the fear of death would not have deterred. But the danger perhaps was not so great. Adrian seldom acted cruelly, except when he was moved by suspicion, jealousy, or envy; and, whatsoever his temper was, he ever affected to appear generous, mild, open, gentle, and affable. *In colloquiis etiam humillimorum civilissimus fuit*, says Spartian.⁴ Much more might he admit Aristides, who was a learned man, an Athenian, and a philosopher; for he loved to converse with men of letters, and he was, by incorporation, an Athenian. He had been at Athens before he was Emperor; the Athenians had paid him the compliment of ^s making him their *Archon*; and he was always kind to them.

Adrian seems to have had no hatred for the Christians, or for any other religious sects; and to have been more disposed to banter than to persecute them. In a letter to Servianus, in which he gives the Egyptians a very bad character, he observes that Alexandria was inhabited by Jews, Samaritans, Christians, and worshippers of the Egyptian deities; and that all these people, notwithstanding their diversity of opinions, and their religious squabbles, in reality worshipped only *one* God, and that God was *Money*.⁵

Adrian gave a rescript to Minucius Fundanus concerning the Christians,⁷ which is obscure. It is probable that he composed it so on purpose, for the same reason that moved his predecessor

² Hist. Eccl. p. 624.

³ Præf. p. lxxxiv.

⁴ V. Adr. c. 20.

⁵ Tillemont, *Hist des Emp.* ii. p. 197.

⁶ See *Vopiscus*, Saturnin. 8. p. 719; and the *Miscell. Observ.* ii. p. 309. The Egyptians had no extraordinary character with many people. Vid. Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 1128.

⁷ Preserved in Euseb. H. E. iv. 9, and at the end of Justin's first Apology.

Trajan to grant the Christians only an half-favour, and a sort of connivance. Thus Severus Alexander paid divine honours to Christ, and was very kind to the Christians; and yet, as Lampridius expresses it pretty accurately, *Judæis privilegia reservavit; Christianos esse passus est.*⁸ Adrian's rescript, though it does not manifestly exempt Christians from punishment, yet seems in some degree to favour them; and might have been so interpreted by a judge, who was disposed to put the mildest construction upon it. The Christians therefore made their use of it, and often appealed to it.

Lampridius, who was a Pagan, mentions a report that Adrian had a design to deify Jesus Christ, and to build him a temple; but he positively affirms that Severus Alexander intended it. He adds that the emperor—I suppose he means Alexander—was deterred by some persons, probably Pagan priests; who, consulting the gods, found, as they said, that, if such a thing were executed, Christianity would be established, and Paganism abolished.⁹ The report concerning Adrian's design was groundless in all probability:¹ and yet it evidently shews that he never passed for an enemy to Christianity.

Since the Christian² Apologists reproach the Pagans for their human sacrifices, Quadratus and Aristides may be supposed to have touched upon that subject.³ Adrian forbade this wicked practice, and also made laws in favour of slaves.

⁸ In vit. Sev. cc. 22; 29.

⁹ Ibid. c. 43, *Christo templum facere voluit [Severus Alexander], eumque inter Deos recipere. Quod et Adrianus cogitasse fertur, qui templa in omnibus civitatibus sine simulacris jusserat fieri: quæ hodie, idcirco quia non habent numina, dicuntur Adriania, quæ ille ad hoc parasse dicebatur. Sed prohibitus est ab iis qui, consulentes sacra, repperant omnes Christianos futuros si id optato evenisset, et templa reliqua, deserenda. Interea ea traditio Lampridii nobis lucro est. Etenim si imaginibus referta tum temporis fuissent templa Christianorum, fingi nullo potuisset modo, Adriania numinibus vacua Christo fuisse posita. Neque Adriano aliquid causæ fuisset, cur ejusmodi templa conderet, expertia simulacrorum, si Ecclesia in more habuit imagines in templis collocare. Nullæ quoque, Constantino imperante, imagines Christianorum in Basilicis, videbantur, utpote quæ ad similitudinem Adrianiorum accedebant.* Basnage, Annal. ii. p. 60.

¹ See Spartian. *Adr.* c. 13; and Basnage, *Annal.* ii. p. 59.

² Dr. Middleton, and many besides him, have observed that of the Christian Apologists the latter often copy the earlier; and a man who reads them must be blind not to see it, or perverse not to own it.

³ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* ii. 262, etc. See also Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* iv. 16, 17.

Several apologies were afterwards made by Christians, addressed sometimes to the emperors and the senate.⁴ Pagans of rank and quality were perhaps not much moved by them, yet they must have had some knowledge of them; for doubtless the Christians, who valued neither danger nor money nor labour, when the common cause required it, and of whom some were of good families and fortunes, got them transcribed, and handed them about to persons of eminence; and it could be no difficult thing to give them to those emperors who had learning and humanity. And indeed, which is very remarkable, the apologies are addressed to such sort of emperors; to Adrian, Titus Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius, Lucius Verus, and perhaps to ⁵ Commodus, who, bad as he was, yet shewed kindness to the Christians. The emperors commonly were accessible enough, and did not use to hide themselves, like eastern monarchs. Augustus, for example, suffered all persons to approach him, and when a poor man once offered him a petition in a timorous manner, with a hand half extended and half drawn back, the emperor jested with him, and told him that he looked as if he was giving a half-penny to an elephant.⁶ Nor was the style of the apologists such as could disgust the readers. They wrote in general as well, and with as much learning, elegance, vivacity, and good sense, as their Pagan contemporaries. These Christians were by no means obscure and contemptible persons; they had enjoyed a liberal education; they were learned, and some of them had been philosophers, and retained the habit of philosophers; and in those days a philosopher and a man of letters might have access to persons of the highest rank and quality. Le Clerc was far from thinking that the ancient defenders of Christianity were quite despised by the Heathen, as some are willing to imagine. On the contrary, he supposes that their arguments against Paganism contributed greatly to its destruction. "It is very necessary for those who would be well

⁴ Among others, the *Apologies of Apollinaris, Miltiades, Theophilus, and Minutius Felix*, may be especially mentioned.—EDIT.

⁵ Tillemont, *Hist. Eccl.* ii. p. 631; and Justin M. *Ed. Paris* 1742. *Præf.* p. cxii.

⁶ *Promiscuis salutationibus admittebat et plebem, tanta comitate adeuntium desideria excipiens, ut quendam joco corripuerit, quod sic sibi libellum porrigere dubitaret, quasi elephanto stipem.* *Suet. Aug.* 53.

acquainted with Ecclesiastical History, to read the authors who in the early ages composed apologies for Christianity, and at the same time overset the religion of the heathen. These were the first attacks which were made on Paganism, and which gave the very Pagans such a disgust for it, that almost the whole Roman empire declared for Christianity, as soon as it was safe to do so."

XIV.—OF JEWS AND CHRISTIANS UNDER DOMITIAN, TRAJAN, AND ADRIAN.

UNDER Adrian the Jews revolted, and were severely handled; and Jerusalem was again taken and sacked and burnt, and totally destroyed, according to several writers. *The melancholy view of its ruinous condition caused an infinite number of people to embrace Christianity; as it set before their eyes the truth of Christ's predictions.*⁷

At this time lived *Aquila*, who translated the Bible into Greek. He was converted from Paganism by the *piety* and *miracles* of the Christians, says Epiphanius;⁸ and afterwards apostatized, and went over to Judaism.¹ But Epiphanius was made up of

⁷ Bibl. Chois. xxvii. 426.

⁸ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* ii. 295; for which he refers us to Eusebius, *Demonstr. Evang.* p. 407, *Ed. Par.* But this accurate author is here mistaken, I think; and makes Eusebius say more than can fairly be inferred from his words. See the passage, which is too long to be here inserted.

⁹ De Mens. cc. 14, 15.

¹ The conversion, or rather the apostacy, of Aquila, from Christianity to Judaism, is represented in the Rabbinical writings as miraculous; and, on the other hand, there is a tradition, worthy of little credit perhaps, that the dowry of a Jewish heiress had no inconsiderable effect in working the change. Epiphanius remarks, *ubi supra*, that his translation of the Hebrew Scriptures was undertaken with a strong bias against the LXX interpreters; of whose version his countrymen endeavoured to dispute the fidelity, and even instituted a solemn fast in execration of it, in consequence of the reverence with which it was regarded by Christians, and the irrefragable arguments from prophecy thence deduced in favour of the gospel. Hence he perverted several passages of Scripture to the support of his own views, and corrupted the various testimonies, which they afforded to the Messiah. Jerome moreover affirms (*Comm. in Esai.* viii.), on the authority of the Talmud, that he prosecuted his labours under the direction of R. Akiba, a most inveterate adversary of Christianity; nor do Justin, Irenæus, and other Fathers, hesitate to accuse him of wilful perversion of the Sacred Text. Thus his translation of the word עֹלָם, *olmeh* (*Isai.* vii. 14) by *veâvis*, instead of *παρθένος*, is exposed by Justin (*D. Tryph.* cc. 42, 71); and Irenæus (*Hær.* iii. 21. 1.) The version itself was so extremely literal, and so utterly regardless of the idiom of the language into which

hastiness and credulity, and is never to be trusted where he speaks of a *miracle*. For example : he relates that many fountains and rivers were annually turned into wine on the same day, and at the same hour, when Christ wrought his miracle at Cana in Galilee ; that this wonder continued at Cibyra in Caria, where he himself had drunk out of the fountain, and at Gerasa in Arabia ; and that many testified the same of the river Nile.²

We may conjecture, from the relation of Epiphanius, that there were in his time, *i. e.* in the fourth century, pious knaves, who once a year conveyed wine into the fountain at Cibyra ; and that the Father drank a cup of this adulterated liquor, and was imposed on by these jugglers. The trick might serve for other purposes besides those of a godly nature. It might draw company to the *Wells of Cibyra*, once a year, and enrich the neighbourhood, and the proprietors of the holy water.

This is the civillest thing that we can say of Epiphanius, since he must have been either a dupe or a deceiver. Learned and judicious men, who have examined his writings, have been forced to conclude that, with all his learning and piety, he was credulous, careless, censorious ; and one who made no scruple of romancing and misrepresenting. The miracle of the fountains is just as good as that recorded by Orosius, that the tracks of Pharaoh's chariot-wheels remained in the sand of the Red Sea, and that neither the winds nor the waves could efface them.

Here is another tradition of the same kind from Epiphanius.

it was transfused, as, according to Origen, δουλεύειν τῇ Ἑβραϊκῇ λέξει. Thus also Jerome :—*Aquila, proselytus et contentiosus interpres, qui non solum verba, sed et etymologias verborum transferre conatus est, jure projicitur a nobis. Quis enim pro frumento, et vino, et oleo, possit vel legere vel intelligere χεῦμα, ὀπωρισμὸν, στιλβότητα, quod nos possumus dicere fusionem, pomationem, et splendentiam.* There were two editions of this translation, of which the last was most literal. Only a few fragments of it remain. Justinian's 146th Institute has been understood to permit the use of the versions of the Aquila or LXX. indiscriminately in the synagogues ; but Hody is more correct in his opinion that the *Mischna* is there intended.—EDIT.

² The Pagans had miracles of the same kind. Plin. ii. 106. N. H. *In Andro insula, templo Liberi Patris, fontem Nonis Januariis semper vini sapore fluere Mucianus ter Consul credit.* Idem, xxxi. 13. *Mucianus Andri, e fonte Liberi Patris, statis diebus septenis ejus Dei vinum fluere, si auferatur a conspectu templi, sapore in aquam transeunte.* Baronius was either so credulous, or so disingenuous, as to urge this miracle at Andros in confirmation of those which are attested by Epiphanius. It was an artifice of the priests of Bacchus, and served to delude silly Pagans, as S. Basnage observes (*Ann.* i. 217).

Jerome mentions a particularity of the fountain Siloam, that it flows not regularly, but bursts out with great violence at different times.³ If we may believe Epiphanius, God produced this fountain at the prayer of Isaiah, a little before the death of that prophet, when he was just expiring, and wanted water to drink; and thence it was called *Siloam*, or *Sent*. He adds, that when the Jews were besieged, if they went to draw water there, it sprang up in great abundance; but if their enemies approached to it, it withdrew itself: in testimony of which, says he, the fountain still bursts out at intervals, and suddenly.⁴ This fable also is transcribed by Baronius, as a thing to be credited, for which he is justly censured by S. Basnage,⁵ whom the reader may consult.

But what Josephus affirms concerning the fountain at the time when Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans, and which is also taken notice of by Basnage, is extremely remarkable; and should be added to what has been said concerning the wonders which happened at the destruction of Jerusalem, and which showed that God had forsaken the Jews.⁶ *Even the fountains flow profusely for Titus, which refused their streams to you: for this you know, that before his coming, Siloam, and all the springs without the city, failed to such a degree, that water was bought by the pitcher, but now they are so profusely liberal to your enemies, as to supply not only them and their beasts, but the gardens also.*⁷

In the time of Domitian, Trajan, and Adrian, lived *Plutarch*. In his numerous writings he never makes any mention of the Christian religion; perhaps not daring to speak well, and not caring to speak ill of it, says Tillemont. I rather think that he had never examined it, or concerned himself about it. Philosophy and history engrossed his thoughts and his time.

A little earlier flourished *Quintilian*, who has made a slight

³ Siloam autem fontem esse ad radices montis Sion, qui non jugibus aquis, sed in certis horis diebusque ebulliat, et per terrarum concava et antra saxi durissimi cum magno impetu veniat, dubitare non possumus, nos præsertim qui in hac habitamus provincia. *In Esai. viii.*

⁴ De Vit. Proph.

⁵ Ann. i. p. 334.

⁶ See above, pp. 14, &c.

⁷ Bell. Jud. v. 9, Τίτω μὲν γὰρ καὶ πηγαὶ πλουσιώτεραι ῥέουσιν, αἱ ξηρανθεῖσαι πρότερον ὑμῶν. Πρὸ γὰρ τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας, τὴν τε Σιλωὰμ ἐπιλιποῦσαν ἴσταν, καὶ τὰς ἔξω τοῦ ἁστέος ἀπάσας, ὥστε πρὸς ἀμφορεῖς ὠνεῖσθαι τὸ ὕδωρ· τὸ δὲ νῦν οὕτω πληθύνουσι τοῖς πολεμίοις ὑμῶν, ὥς μὴ μόνον αὐτοῖς καὶ κτήνεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κήποις διαρκεῖν.

mention of Judaism. *Et est conditoribus urbium infame contraxisse aliquam perniciosam cæteris gentem, qualis est primus Judaicæ superstitionis auctor.*^s Some have imagined that he meant Christ and the Christians, but it is plain to the last degree that he reflects upon Moses. He had probably in view the conquests which that people made under Moses and Joshua, and their war with Vespasian and the Romans.

XV. OF JUSTIN, HEGESIPPUS, AND THE ENCRATITES.

About A. D. 130 flourished Justin, the first Christian author, after those who are called Apostolical; a virtuous, pious, honest man, and incapable of wilfully deceiving; but a hasty writer, and of a warm and credulous temper. He was highly and justly esteemed by the ancient Christians, and Eusebius makes honourable mention of him, as of one ἐν τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς διαπρέψας λόγῳ. He speaks of his two Apologies, his Dialogue with Trypho, and some other treatises; and produces some passages from that dialogue, which show that he had it as we have it now.

Justin wanted neither learning, nor vivacity, nor an unartificial eloquence. The love of Truth was his predominant passion, to which he sacrificed all worldly considerations, and for which he laid down his life with great resolution; and therefore whosoever loves truth, should love him and his memory. "Galen," says our amiable writer John Hales,—“Galen, that great physician, speaks thus of himself: ‘I know not how, even from my youth up, in a wonderful manner, whether by divine inspiration, or by fury and possession, or however you may please to style it, I have much contemned the opinion of the many; but truth and knowledge I have above measure affected, verily persuading myself that a fairer, a more divine fortune could never befall a man.’ Some title, some little claim I may justly lay to the words of this excellent person; for the pursuit of truth hath been my only care, ever since I understood the meaning of the word. For this I have forsaken all hopes, all friends, all desires, which might bias me, and hinder me from driving right at what I aimed. For this I have spent my money, my means, my youth, my age, and all that I have.—If with all this cost and pains my

^s Inst. Or. iii. 7, p. 270. Ed. Burm.

purchase is but error, I may safely say, To err hath cost me more than it has many to find the truth : and Truth shall give me this testimony at last, that if I have missed of her, it is not my fault, but my misfortune." Justin would not perhaps have expressed himself upon this subject with the same strength and elegance ; but he had the same turn of mind.

In the first Apology,⁹ he says to the emperors, *We desire a fair trial, and no favour : if we are guilty, punish us ; if we are innocent, protect us. We do not desire you to punish our calumniators : their own wickedness and ignorance is punishment enough.* Οὐ γὰρ τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας κολάζειν ὑμᾶς ἀξιόσομεν· ἀρκοῦνται γὰρ τῇ προσούσῃ πονηρίᾳ καὶ τῇ τῶν καλῶν ἀγνοίᾳ. Cicero had a thought of the same kind, but he spoiled it. He says somewhere, *Odi hominem, et odero. Utinam ulcisci possem ; sed ulciscuntur illum mores sui.*

We are slain with the sword, says Justin,¹ we are crucified, we are cast to the wild beasts, we are bound with chains, tortured, and burnt ; and yet we are not only constant to our profession, but we increase and multiply : the more we are persecuted and destroyed, the more are added to our numbers. As a vine, by being pruned and cut close, puts forth new shoots, and bears a greater abundance of fruit, so is it with us who are the vine which God and his Christ have planted. Ὅποιον ἐὰν ἀμπέλου τις ἐκτέμῃ τὰ καρποφορήσαντα μέρη, εἰς τὸ ἀναβλαστῆσαι ἑτέρους κλάδους καὶ εὐθαλεῖς καὶ καρποφόρους ἀναδίδωσι, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῶν γίνεται· ἡ γὰρ φυτευθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄμπελος καὶ σωτήρος Χριστοῦ, ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστι.²

The account which Justin gives of himself, as seeking truth among the philosophers, the Stoics, the Peripatetics, Pythagoreans, and Platonics, and finding it in Christianity,³ is spritely

⁹ Apol. i. c. 7. Adrian, however, in his rescript to Minutius Fontanus, directed that those who accused the Christians falsely should be punished.—EDIT.

¹ Dial. c. Tryph. c. 110.

² Compare Hor. Carm. iv. 4, 57 :—

*Duris ut ilex tonsa bipennibus,
Nigræ feraci frondis in Algido,
Per damna, per cædes, ab ipso
Ducit opes animumque ferro.*

³ The immediate cause of Justin's conversion, as related by himself in the Dialogue with Trypho (cc. 3, sqq.), is exceedingly interesting, and has been thought,

and entertaining; and so is the manner in which he censures the Jews.⁴ *It was foretold of you*, says he to Trypho, *that you should be as the sand of the sea-shore; and so indeed you are: if as numerous, as barren likewise, and as unfruitful of all that is good; ever ready to receive the refreshing dews and rain of heaven, and never willing and disposed to make any return.*⁵

I shall not undertake the vindication of Justin concerning the celebrated statue erected to Simon Magus.⁶ I am inclined to

though perhaps without reason, to convey the idea of an extraordinary communication from above. In his anxiety to arrive at the knowledge of the truth, which he had failed to acquire by a careful investigation of the different philosophical systems, he commonly pursued his inquiries in a retired spot upon the sea-shore. Here he was one day found by an aged man, of venerable appearance, who explained to him the evidence from prophecy and miracle, directed him to *search the Scriptures*, and, exhorting him to pray earnestly and constantly for God's blessing upon his inquiries, left him in the fixed determination of prosecuting his studies with unremitting diligence. It appears from a passage already quoted by Jortin, that his heart had been already touched by the firmness evinced by the Christians under persecution; his judgment also was at length convinced; and he gratefully acknowledged that Christianity was *the only sound and useful philosophy*. D. Tryph. c. 8. *ταύτην μόνην εὑρισκον φιλοσοφίαν ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ σύμφορον*. Besides the *Dialogue with Trypho*, from which we derive what is known of the author's history, several other works, of which some are unquestionably spurious, have been attributed to him. Of those which are genuine, his two *Apologies* are his most valuable productions; the former addressed to *Antoninus Pius*, with whom M. Antoninus and L. Verus are included in the inscription, about A.D. 139; the latter to *M. Antoninus*, in the year 162.—EDIT.

⁴ The *Dialogue with Trypho*, whom some have regarded as an imaginary personage, is valuable as a proof that the tenets of the Jews in Justin's time are still cherished by their descendants; and the arguments which he employs will not have lost their force in reasoning with an Israelite at the present day. At the same time it is defaced by many weak and inconclusive inferences, and many erroneous interpretations of Scripture. The discussion is conducted in a rambling and desultory manner. Indeed a connected arrangement is by no means a distinguishing feature in the writings of this Father.—EDIT.

⁵ D. Tryph. c. 120.

⁶ Justin (Apol. i. c. 34) says that "Simon, who was a Samaritan, performed magical wonders at Rome, in the reign of Claudius; that he was regarded as a God; and that his statue had been erected on the banks of the Tiber, with the Latin inscription, SIMONI DEO SANCTO." Besides *Thirlby*, whose bantering vindication of the accuracy of this statement contains much information that is really valuable, Justin has found defenders in Baronius, Tillemont, Jenkin, and lately in Dr. Burton (*Bampt. Lect.* p. 374). Although many of the arguments adduced in favour of the story, which is repeated by Tertullian (Apol. c. 13), Irenæus (*Hær.* i. 20), Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 13), and others, carry with them considerable weight, yet they are by no means decisive of the question. In the year 1574, a stone was dug up in the island of the Tiber, which proved to be part of a statue dedicated by Sextus Pompey to *Semo Sancus*, a God of the Sabines. The first words of a legend, inscribed thereon,

think that he was mistaken, and that the proud Romans would never have deified a Samaritan knave, and a strolling magician. It seems more probable that they would have sent him to the house of correction, or have bestowed transportation upon him, or a 'stone-doublet' sooner than a statue. Dr. Thirlby, who pleads Justin's cause, concludes thus: *Si quis autem quærat quid de hac re ipse sentiam, patroni me potius quam judicis partes egisse negare non possum, quæque dixi, non tam veritatis gratia, quam Justinì dixisse; cujus mihi cum editione defensio ex veteri more necessario suscipienda erat.* It is easy enough to know what this means, though some persons have made a shift to misunderstand it.

In behalf of Justin it might be said, that as worthless men as Simon had religious respect paid to them about the time when Justin wrote, or not long after. Alexander, the impostor perhaps, and false prophet; and Peregrinus, called Proteus, another knave, both of whom Lucian has satirically celebrated, and of whom the latter burnt himself publicly; and one Neryllinus, an obscure mortal, had statues erected to them at Troas and Parium in the time of Marcus Aurelius, and when Neryllinus was living: to which statues divine honours were paid, and which were said to give oracles, and to work miracles. So cheap was deification in those days! This we learn from Athenagoras. *Τρωὰς καὶ Πάριον ἡ μὲν Νερυλλίνου εἰκόνας ἔχει, ὃς ἀνὴρ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς τὸ δὲ Πάριον, Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Πρωτέος. Τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔτι ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ ὁ τάφος, καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν. Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι ἀνδριάντες τοῦ Νηρυλλίνου, κόσμημά εἰσι δημόσιον—εἷς δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ χρηματίζειν καὶ ἰᾶσθαι νοσοῦντας νομίζεται καὶ θύουσί τε δι' αὐτὰ, καὶ χρύσῳ περιαλείφουσι, καὶ στεφανοῦσι τὸν ἀνδριάντα οἱ Τρωαδεῖς· ὁ δὲ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου, καὶ ὁ τοῦ Πρωτέως—ὁ μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς λέγεται χρηματίζειν· τῷ δὲ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου—δημοτελεῖς ἄγονται θυσίαι καὶ ἑορταί, ὡς ἐπηκόῳ θεῷ.⁷*

Epiphanes, the son of the heretic Carpocrates, and a heretic as well as his father, was deified about the middle of the second century, or the time when Justin wrote. The account is remarkable: *Ἐπιφανῆς, οὗ καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα κομίζεται, υἱὸς ἦν Καρ-*

were these: SEMONI SANCO DEO FIDIO SACRUM. This simple fact amounts to something more than a probability that Justin was mistaken; and that his error was adopted, without inquiry, by subsequent writers.—EDIT.

⁷ Hom. Il. Γ. 57. λαῖνον χιτῶνα.

⁸ Legat. p. 122. ed. Ox.

ποκράτους* τὰ μὲν πρὸς πατρὸς Ἀλεξανδρὸς, ἀπὸ δὲ μητρὸς Κεφαλληνὸς* ἔζησε δὲ τὰ πάντα ἔτη ἑπτακαίδεκα, καὶ θεὸς ἐν Σάμῃ τῆς Κεφαλληνίας τετίμηται, ἔνθα αὐτῷ ἱερὸν ῥυτῶν λίθων, βωμοὶ, τεμένη, μουσεῖον ᾧ κοδόμηταί τε καὶ καθιέρωνται* καὶ συνιόντες εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν οἱ Κεφαλλῆνες κατὰ νουμηνίαν, γένεθλιον ἀποθέωσιν θύουσιν Ἐπιφάνει* σπένδουσί τε καὶ ἑυωχοῦνται, καὶ ὕμνοι λέγονται.⁹ Here is the canonization or apotheosis of a young heretic performed in an exact and ample manner by these Cephallenian blockheads. Now Simon, it may be said, might have acquired such honours as Epiphanes, who, though he was ingenious, was but a boy.

If any one thinks that these examples tend to support Justin, they are at his service. Dr. Thirlby, when I once mentioned them to him, thought them observable, and fit to be produced on this subject.

We have the Acts of Justin's martyrdom,¹ which seem in the main to be genuine, and to contain a true narration of his courageous behaviour, and of his sufferings.

Without detracting from the merits of this worthy man, we ought to acknowledge, what truth and plain matter of fact extort from us, that he, and the rest of the Fathers, are often poor and insufficient guides in things of judgment and criticism, and in the interpretation of the Scriptures, and sometimes in points of morality also and of doctrine; as Daillé, Whitby, Barbeyrac, and others have fully showed. The men themselves usually deserve much respect, and their writings are highly useful² on several accounts; but it is better to defer too little,

⁹ Clement. Alex. *Strom.* iii. p. 511.

¹ According to these *Acts*, which are given in *Baronius*, Justin was beheaded about A.D. 165, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. Other dates have been assigned to his martyrdom; but this seems to be correct. He met his death with that composure which, exhibited in others, excited his admiration before his conversion, and evinced the truth of a favourite saying of his own, that *persecution may kill, but it cannot harm*.—EDIT.

² The learned defender of Dr. Chapman's Charge hath pointed out their utility. See p. 40, &c. [By different parties and for different purposes, the authority of the Fathers has been differently estimated; and while some would raise them above their legitimate importance, others would consign them to undeserved neglect. Their real value lies between the two extremes. They are by no means to be exalted to an equality with the Scriptures, and received as an infallible guide in matters of religion; neither are they to be rejected as utterly unworthy of credit, and as dealers in pious frauds, and inventors of legendary fables. The consequences that have lately arisen from an undue submission to their judgment, may almost seem to justify the fear which induced M. Daillé to denounce them as worthless; but on the other hand, a

than too much, to their decisions, and to the authority of *Antiquity*, that *handmaid to Scripture*, as she is called. She is like *Briareus*, and has a *hundred hands*, and these hands often clash, and beat one another.

just and impartial estimate of their merits, such as that which was taken by our venerable Reformers, and has been duly appreciated by our ablest and soundest divines, cannot fail to render them of essential service to the inquiries of the scholar and the divine. In the evidence which they afford to *matters of fact*, their testimony is peculiarly important. They may be right or wrong in the interpretation of a text, or the exposition of a doctrine ; we may not choose, for instance, to assent to any of the various notions which they have promulgated respecting the mystery of the Trinity ; but it would be idle to assert that the doctrine was not recognised in the primitive Church, in the face of their united evidence from the apostles downwards. On the other hand, had there been no allusion in their writings to this great and fundamental doctrine of the Gospel, though the Scriptures of the New Testament would still have been sufficient to establish its certainty, such a remarkable omission could not have been otherwise regarded than as a most unaccountable anomaly in the religious history of mankind. Indeed the *negative* testimony, which the silence of the Fathers sometimes affords in relation to divers tenets of modern times, is scarcely less important than their *positive* assertions. At the Reformation, for instance, the Papists did not hesitate to appeal to the early Church, in defence of their corruptions ; but no sooner did Jewel make the same appeal on behalf of the Reformers, than the weakness of his adversaries was completely exposed. He challenged them to produce a single record, from the genuine writings of the primitive Christians, containing an allusion to the sacrifice of the mass, the adoration of the Virgin, or any of those idolatries which the Protestants abjured ; and the plea of apostolical usage vanished at once. Not that such authority would have been a valid support of the Romish errors, condemned, as they are, by the whole body of the Scriptures ; but the want of this authority destroyed even the *traditional* antiquity to which they pretended. Precisely in the same degree, the allusion of a Father to any apostolical custom mentioned in the New Testament, attests the continuance of such usage in the ages immediately succeeding : and certain forms and ceremonies, which they relate to have been adopted by the apostles, may be considered as traced through them to the earliest antiquity. Thus we find that the sign of the cross in baptism was employed in the purest ages of the Church ; and tradition, such as this, is justly regarded as a sufficient reason against its abolition. Nor does the authority of the Fathers altogether rest here. In their holy lives and persevering stedfastness, the purity of the Christian religion, and the sincerity of their attachment to it, are pre-eminently exemplified : the arguments employed in their writings will frequently furnish the means of resisting the inroads of modern scepticism, and the innovations of heterodoxy, fanaticism, and fraud ; and the spirit in which their controversies were conducted will inspire a firm and unbending spirit in the cause of righteousness, tempered with moderation, and free from asperity and ill-will. Their expositions of Scripture, though not unfrequently incorrect, may generally be consulted with advantage ; and their *practical* admonitions are the very essence of unaffected piety, earnest exhortation, honest enthusiasm, affectionate solicitude, and patient zeal. "Inquire then, I pray thee, of the former age, and prepare thyself to the search of their fathers. For we are but of yesterday, and know nothing. Shall they not teach thee, and tell thee, and utter words out of their heart." (Job viii. 8.)—EDIT.]

The genuineness³ of Justin's Dialogue has been called in question by Christianus Gotlieb Kochius, Gothofredus Wagnerus, and I know not who; whose names, if Fabricius and Thirlby had not preserved them from oblivion, would have been lost long ago. Father Harduin also, though for a time he thought fit to spare this valuable treatise, yet afterwards, I think, did it the honour to reject it, along with the rest of Justin's works; which is one argument, and not a bad one, in its favour.

About A.D. 146, *Hegesippus* wrote an Ecclesiastical History. He was a weak and credulous man;⁴ much such another as Papias. He gives us a history of the martyrdom of James, Bishop of Jerusalem, which is no better than a legend, and which Eusebius should not have related, without adding, as he has on some other occasions, *Of this let every one judge as he thinks proper.*⁵

Towards A.D. 170, arose the sect of the *Encratites*, followers of *Tatian*, Justin's disciple.⁶ They condemned marriage, wine,

³ Among those who have cast a doubt upon the genuineness of the *Dialogue*, is *Wetstein*, in the Prolegomena to his edition of the Greek Testament. Bishop Kaye has examined and refuted his arguments, which are derived from Justin's apparent ignorance of the LXX. version of the Hebrew Scriptures, in his valuable treatise on the writings and opinions of Justin (p. 20); a work which the student, who is entering upon the study of this Father, will scarcely fail to adopt as an indispensable guide.—EDIT.

⁴ In this opinion Jortin follows Dupin, and other modern writers; but the ancients, who had better means of judging, seem to have thought otherwise. The Ecclesiastical History of *Hegesippus* is represented by Jerome as containing a great variety of useful information, and written in a plain and simple style, similar to that of the apostles. Such at least appears to be the import of his words: *Quinque libros composuit sermone simplici, ut, quorum (scil. Apostolorum) vitam sectabatur, dicendi quoque exprimeret characterem.* (Vir. Ill. i. 22.) His account of the martyrdom of James the Just, will be found to merit anything rather than the severe criticism in the text. Jortin's date (A.D. 146) must refer to the earlier portion of his life, though Jerome places him before Justin, and Eusebius speaks of him as ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν Ἀποστόλων γενόμενος διαδοχῆς (H. E. ii. 22); for his history was carried beyond the appointment of Eleutherus to the see of Rome, which took place in the year 169, some years after Justin's martyrdom.—EDIT.

⁵ See p. 251.

⁶ Euseb. H. E. iv. 29. It appears from Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. p. 460, A), that Tatian argued against the lawfulness of marriage from 1 Cor. vii. 5; Gal. vi. 8. He also perverted the words, *In Adam all die* (1 Cor. xv. 22), into a declaration that Adam was not saved (Iren. Hær. iii. 23. 8); some of St. Paul's Epistles he rejected altogether (Jerome Comm. in. Tit.); denied the reality of Christ's sufferings; and advanced sundry other heretical opinions. It is from his *Oration against the Gentiles*, however, that he is principally known; and this apologetic treatise, which is still

and animal food. Others before them had held the same doctrines; doctrines expressly foretold and condemned by St. Paul.⁷ But before the fourth century was ended, these and other corruptions were widely spread, or at least the foundation of them was laid, in superstitious and injudicious mortifications, monkery, lying wonders, feigned apparitions, excessive honours paid to departed saints, and to their relics; as Jos. Mede intimates, and Sir Isaac Newton and others have sufficiently showed.

In the persecution under Marcus Aurelius, Alcibiades and Attalus suffered death. Alcibiades was one who abstained from all food, except bread and water. It was revealed to Attalus, whilst they were in prison, that his companion did wrong, and set a bad example, in refusing to make use of God's creatures; upon which Alcibiades obeyed, and ate of such things as were set before him. Eusebius relates this,⁸ and took it from an Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, in Gaul. They who defend the fasts and abstinences of the ancient monks, may try how they can reconcile these things together.

XVI. OF THE THUNDERING LEGION; AND OF MEN AND THINGS UNDER M. AURELIUS AND COMMODUS.

When Marcus Aurelius was at war with the *Quadi* (A.D. 174), and in the utmost distress and danger, his army was relieved by extant, is free from every heretical bias, and has been very generally commended by ecclesiastical writers. The style is polished and elegant; and the deep research of the writer, as well as his extensive acquaintance with the literature and mythology of the Greeks, are abundantly displayed in every page; but there is a want of method in the arrangement, and consequently of perspicuity in the design. The main scope of the argument is to demonstrate the superior excellence of the Christian religion and the great antiquity of the sacred records. With this view he maintains that the claims, which were laid by the Greeks to the invention of philosophy and the sciences, belonged in reality to nations of much earlier origin, and were by them perverted to the most corrupt and flagitious purposes. He speaks, in the course of his argument, of the nature and attributes of the one true God; of the creation of the world by the *Logos*; of the fall of man and his redemption by Christ; of the resurrection of the body and the final judgment. With respect to the antiquity of the Holy Scriptures, he traces them to a much higher date than the poems of Homer; and throughout he exposes, with the most caustic sarcasm, the absurdities of the Pagan worship, and the flagrant impurities of their religious rites. The *Oration* seems to have been written after the death of Justin, of whom his pupil speaks with the most devout respect (p. 157, D), and in all probability between the years 168 and 172.—EDIT.

⁷ 1 Tim. iv. 1.

⁸ H. E. v. 3.

a plentiful shower of rain, together with hail, thunder, and lightning, which so incommoded his enemies, that the elements seemed to fight for him. The fact is attested by many writers, Pagan and Christian; and by the *Columna Antoniniana*, where is represented the figure of *Jupiter Pluvius*. The Pagans ascribed it to the incantations of some magician, or to the virtues of the Emperor; and the Christians to the prayers of the Christian soldiers.

This produced a *silly story* of the *Thundering Legion*, and a *forged letter* of the Emperor in favour of the Christians; ⁹ all which agrees not with the persecution which they endured under him and his colleague, *Lucius Verus*. Observe that Eusebius,¹ after producing his vouchers, concludes his narration of the story thus; ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὅπη τις ἐθέλη τιθέσθω.

We are obliged to him for giving us leave to reject it. Moyle² concludes, with wishing no other harm to the believers of the *Thundering Legion*, than that they may also believe the martyrdom of the *Theban Legion*: to which good wish I say, with Le Clerc,³ AMEN. *Qui Bavium non odit, etc.*

There is a stupid and ridiculous *Epistle* of the Emperor *Marcus* still extant, and of a modern date, which is given up even by Tillemont, (who is seldom disposed to make such concessions), and, I believe, by every one else, who knows anything of those matters, one person excepted. We have also an *Epistle* of the same stamp ascribed to *Antoninus Pius*, which was forged by some Christian before the days of Eusebius; and which Thirlby rejects, and the last editor of Justin⁴ defends in his preface, and observes, *Tantus est decreti Imperatoris cum Justiniani Apologia consensus, ut in sententiam S. Martyris constructum videatur*. The observation concerning the *consensus*, is very true; but who would warrant the inference? The forger of the *Epistle* must have been a poor wretch indeed, if he could not take care that the Emperor's answer should favour the petition of Justin. *Mihi fateor suspectum esse hoc edictum, magisque ad mentem Christianorum esse conceptum, quam illud concepturus fuerit Gentilis Imperator.*⁵

⁹ This subject is fully and satisfactorily discussed by Bishop Kaye (Tertullian, p.106); and the authorities are given by Lardner in his *Heathen Testimonies*.—EDIT.

¹ E. H. v. 5.

² See Le Clerc, *Hist. Eccl.* p. 744, and Moyle's *Dissertation*.

³ Bibl. A. et. M. xxvii. 193. [Of the *Theban Legion*, see below, under Diocletian.—EDIT.]

⁴ P. lxxx.

⁵ Dodwell, *Diss.* xi. 257.

As to the Emperor Marcus, with all his amiable and princely qualities, he did not love the Christians, as appears from unquestionable authority ; even from *his own Book*. The philosophers had probably contributed to set him against them ; and his love of philosophy, and the respect which he paid to its possessors, were excessive, and indeed sometimes ridiculous. *A Greek Orator met him once in the street, and asked him where he was going. A man, replied Marcus, is never too old to learn : I am going to Sextus the philosopher, to be instructed by him. O Sun, said the Orator, lifting up his hands, a Roman Emperor, in his old age, trudges with his book like a school-boy, to his master's house, to learn his lesson !* The Orator might well wonder to see him act so out of character, and more like a pedant than a prince.⁶

We are told that Marcus Aurelius, without repealing the old laws which condemned convicted Christians, made an *edict*, that whosoever accused a Christian should be put to death ; and that about ten years after, under his son Commodus, who yet was favourable to the Christians, one Apollonius, a man of eminence, being publicly accused of Christianity (by a slave, as Jerome says), the *delator* had his legs broken for his information, and was executed ; and that Apollonius, persisting in his religion, was condemned by the Senate.⁷ Strange ! that so wise a prince as Marcus Aurelius should make so absurd⁸ an *edict*, who might have made a reasonable one in four words, *NOLVMVS CHRISTIANOS AMPLIVS VEXARI*. Had he not so much interest with the senators as to gain their consent ? That is not to be supposed of an Emperor so much beloved by his subjects. And if he could not have gained it for this reasonable decree,⁹ neither could he have gained it for the other, which, such as it was, would have been very serviceable to the Christians. It is also strange that the informer, knowing the certain death to which he exposed

⁶ *Suidas, et Philostr. Vit. Sophist. ii. 556.*

⁷ *Tertullian in Apol. Euseb. E. H. v. 5, 21 ; Le Clerc, Hist. Eccl. p. 786.*

⁸ The forger of this story had his head full of *the Book of Esther*, and of *the Law of the Medes and Persians which altereth not* ; and imagined that the only way, by which the Emperor could protect the Christians, was to punish their accusers.

⁹ Gallienus, being favourably disposed towards the Christians, gave a rescript which, without these absurdities, secured them in some measure from persecution. (*Euseb. vii. 13.*) Could not Marcus have done as much, if he had been so minded ?

himself, should venture on such a mad and desperate attempt. There must be some mistake in this confused and unaccountable representation.

Shall we then reject the whole story of the martyrdom of Apollonius? We need not go so far: we may rather suppose that as the Romans under bad Emperors had suffered intolerably from the base villainy and perjuries of *informers*, and had the whole *crew* in abomination;¹ and as there had been edicts made against *delators* by Titus, Nerva, and Trajan; the persons then in authority might strain a point to cut off this obscure and detested villain, and yet might not be willing to spare Apollonius after he had been publicly accused: for the Senate in general was never favourable to Christianity, and therefore some Emperors, who were not void of good qualities, oppressed the Christians, to gain the esteem of that body, and to pass for zealous defenders of the Roman laws and customs.

The senate might condemn Apollonius by Trajan's *Rescript* to Pliny, and yet not care to encourage informations. If Apollonius was accused by his own slave, the slave, I think, by the Roman laws was liable to be put to death.² The Emperor Tacitus afterwards ordered that slaves should not bear witness against their masters, even in crimes of high treason.³ Trajan forbid the Christians to be sought after; that is, he testified his dislike of it; but he made no law against the accusers of Christians, and subjected them to no penalties. When Cyprian was brought to his trial before the Proconsul of Africa, that magistrate asked him to give him the names of the Presbyters of Carthage. Cyprian replied that he would not discover them, and that even the civil laws justly condemned delators.⁴

The death of Apollonius is a proof that the *Epistles* which we have of Antoninus Pius and of Marcus Aurelius, which expressly forbid Christians to be put to death for their religion, were

¹ Tacitus hated them heartily, and calls them, *genus hominum publico exitio repperitum, et poenis nunquam satis coercitum*. The younger Pliny was of the same mind. But men of honour have ever agreed in disliking and shunning such vermin, though men of power have sometimes been fond of them. See Cicero Orat. pro Roscio, c. 20.

² Cod. L. x. Tit. xi. and the notes.

³ In eadem oratione cavit ut servi in dominorum capita non interrogarentur, ne in causa majestatis quidem.—*Vopiscus Tacito*, p. 608.

⁴ Act. Cypr.

forgeries; for the rescripts of emperors, unless repealed, were in some measure Roman laws.⁵

In the time of Marcus Aurelius lived *Lucian* and *Apuleius*. Lucian was partly a sceptic, partly an 'Epicurean; an elegant, ingenious, loose, and immodest writer. It is no wonder that he did not like Christianity; yet he has said so much, in the way of ridicule, against superstition, and the worship of the gods, and the sophistry of the philosophers, that he may possibly be considered, in that respect, as a kind of apologist, who contributed, though undesignedly, to the advancement of religion, if it be allowed that *Virtus est vitium fugere, et sapientia prima Stultitia caruisse*. The notion that he was an apostate from Christianity is groundless.⁷ Bourdelotius, on this occasion, says, *Qui mendaciis suis invicem credunt, Christianum fuisse arbitrantur, supposititiorum pravitate decepti*. Saucy enough! *Qui mendaciis suis invicem credunt*, is taken from Minucius Felix; and is the character which the Pagan, in the Dialogue, bestows upon *all the Christians* in general.

Apuleius passed for a philosopher and magician. The first of these characters he desired and deserved; the second he loudly disclaimed. Some Pagans, after his time, were so very silly as to oppose to the miracles of Christ those of Apuleius, of which there was not one upon record.⁸

Augustine seems to have had a small doubt whether Apuleius was really transmographed into an ass. If he had lived in the days of Apuleius, and had said so, the philosopher would have returned the compliment upon him.⁹ But in the time of Augustine some Christian miracles were related by himself, and received by the populace, which, for improbability, were not at all inferior to the transformation of Apuleius.

The elegant story of *Cupid and Psyche*,¹ in Apuleius, is

⁵ Quod Principi placuit, legis habet vigorem. *Instit. i. Tit. ii.* See Schulting, *Dissert. pro Rescriptis*.

⁶ He praises and extols Epicurus in his *Alexander*.

⁷ See the Life of Lucian, by Reitzius.

⁸ Bayle's Dict. in APULEIUS.

⁹ Apuleius in Libris, quos *Asini aurei* titulo inscripsit, sibi ipsi accidisse, ut accepto veneno, humano animo permanente, asinus fieret, aut indicavit, aut finxit. Hæc vel falsa sunt, vel tam inusitata, ut merito non credantur.—*De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 18.

¹ Concerning the *Metamorphosis* and the *Apology* of Apuleius, see Mr. Warburton's *Div. Legat.* vol. ii. § 4. [The opinion of Warburton, however, is perhaps more

undoubtedly mystical and allegorical. Porphyry wrote a poem, which is lost, called *ὁ ἱερὸς γάμος*, *The Sacred Nuptials*; by which I suppose was meant the mysterious union of the soul with the Deity: and the enthusiastic sublimity of the poem made some readers conclude that the author was mad; but Plotinus, who was an adept, greatly admired it.²

Irenæus, speaking of the initiations and mysteries of some old heretics, says, *Οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν νυμφῶνα κατασκευάζουσι, καὶ πνευματικὸν γάμον φάσκουσιν εἶναι τὸν ὑπ' αὐτῶν γινόμενον, κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα τῶν ἄνω συζυγιῶν.*³ Here, also, were *spiritual* and *mystical nuptials*; and perhaps *something more*. Enthusiasts and pious mystics have been remarkably fond of *the nuptial style*, and of applying *verba nupta* to godly subjects.⁵

The philosophers about and after the time of Apuleius, had genius and learning, with a dash of fanaticism.⁶ They were dealers in *Theurgy*, or the evocation of inferior gods; and boasted of an intercourse with dæmons, and an union with God. Many ancient Christian writers have spoken handsomely of *Porphyry*, and have done justice to his abilities, though he was an enemy; which at the same time was doing honour to themselves. Porphyry, as far as we may guess from a passage in Jerome, said that the miracles, which the Christians were reported to work, were the tricks of evil dæmons. *Vigilantius*, at the end of the fourth century, had condemned the excessive honours paid to the relics of the saints; for which Jerome reviles

ingenious than solid. It would seem that the *Asinus Aureus* was one of that class of fictions called *Milesian Tales*; and was written to expose the jugglery and immorality of certain orders of priests, who pretended to miraculous powers, and favoured the grossest impositions. An English version, containing also the Tract *De Deo Socratis*, which Augustine has severely censured, was published by T. Taylor, in 1822; and an excellent edition of the entire works of this writer appeared at Leipsic, in 1842, under the care of G. F. Hildebrand.—EDIT.]

² Holstenius, Vit. Porph. c. 10.

³ Vide Euseb. H. E. iv. 11.

⁴ If Irenæus was not misinformed: for the accounts which the Fathers have given of heretics are not to be entirely trusted.

⁵ Witness many of the hymns of our sectaries.—EDIT.

⁶ Il est surprenant que ces Mystiques Chrétiens, et ces Philosophes Payens, aient été si conformes les uns aux autres, qu'on diroit qu'ils s'étoient donné le mot pour débiter les mêmes folies, les uns dans l'orient, et les autres dans l'occident. Quel concert admirable entre des gens qui ne s'étoient jamais vus, et qui n'avoient jamais ouï parler les uns des autres! Bayle Dict. in TAULERUS. See the place, and the references.

him, and says, *Spiritus iste immundus, qui te hæc cogit scribere, sæpe hoc vilissimo tortus est pulvere, imo hodieque torquetur; et qui in te plagas dissimulat, in cæteris confitetur: nisi forte in morem Gentilium impiorumque, Porphyrii Eunomiique, has præstigias dæmonum esse confingas, et non vere clamare dæmones, sed sua simulare tormenta.*⁷ As we find not in ecclesiastical history that any evil befel Vigilantius, we may conclude that this honest man was gathered to his fathers in peace.⁸ If so, he was a fortunate person, for one who set his face against the public, and to be excepted from the number of those, who by following Truth too close at the heels, have had their teeth knocked out for their pains. A politician would have whispered to him, *Hold your opinion, but hold your tongue.* He came off very well, if he suffered no greater harm than to be called, *fool, blockhead, madman, demoniac, lunatic, heretic, Arian, Eunomian, Samaritan, Jew, Pagan, infidel, apostate, blasphemous, calumniator, despiser of martyrs, bishops, and emperors, glutton, sot, liar, ass, and dog.*

Porphyry made some concessions in favour of Christianity, and acknowledged that the dæmons had revered Christ.⁹ This philosopher was born A. D. 233, and died about A. D. 303. Constantine ordered his writings against Christianity to be suppressed, in which he was ill advised. *Si nihil est nostra religione verius, quid rationes reformidamus?* said Ludovicus Vives.

Plotinus, as Porphyry relates, desired the Emperor Gallienus to rebuild a ruined city in Campania, and to give it to the philosophers; proposing to dwell there himself with his disciples, and to establish Plato's republic. But though he was much in the Emperor's favour, his project met with opposition at court, and came to nothing. *Thus philosophy, though patronised by princes, could never in any age introduce its rules even into one*

⁷ Hier. contra Vigil.

⁸ An account of "Vigilantius and his Times," has lately been published by Dr. Gilly of Durham. Nothing can be more truly seasonable than this interesting and able biography; in which the author vindicates the character of this early Gallic reformer from the calumnies and revilings of Martin and Jerome, and protests, as it were, in his name, against the attempted revival of errors which he so strenuously resisted in the fourth century.—EDIT.

⁹ See Holsten. de Vit. Porphyrii, c. 11; or Euseb. Dem. Evang. p. 134.

*city; and Jesus Christ has established his all over the world, in spite of all worldly opposition from the great and the learned.*¹ A republic of *modern Deists* and *Moral Philosophers* would be as great a curiosity as this *city of Philosophers* would have been; but perhaps not quite so well regulated. Plotinus, if he could have compassed his design, would probably have found it necessary to alter at least one part of the plan in Plato's republic, and to exclude *the community of wives* which that philosopher had a fancy to establish.

The city of Smyrna being overthrown by an earthquake, Marcus Aurelius shewed great kindness to the inhabitants, and liberally assisted them in repairing the loss. Aristides, the sophist, had the honour to be instrumental in this, by writing to the emperor in behalf of the sufferers.

“Aristides, in a discourse which he addresses to the people of Smyrna to congratulate them on their re-establishment, says that their calamity had been deplored by all the inhabitants of Greece and Asia, as a distress common to them all; that every one had been forward to bring provisions to those who remained in the city, and to furnish carriages, houses, and all sorts of conveniences to those who were forced to quit the place, as though they had been the parents or the children of the sufferers. Every one offered them money, and they who had none, promised to furnish it as soon as they were able; and in doing thus, each thought that he did not bestow, but receive, a favour. Such was the change that Christianity had made in the world: for doubtless the Christians, who were numerous in those provinces, had the best share in these acts of charity, and by their zeal inflamed the Pagans also, to make the old proverb lie, that *All the world forgets and neglects the miserable*; which yet till then had been too true.”²

In the time of Marcus Aurelius lived *Bardesanes*, a Syrian. We have a large extract from him in Eusebius,³ containing arguments against fate and astrology.⁴ It is a judicious and

¹ Tillemont, H. E. iii. p. 268.

² Tillemont, H. des Emp. iii. p. 391.

³ Præp. Ev. vi. 11.

⁴ It seems to have been the purpose of this Treatise *de Fato*, which was written before he had exhibited heretical opinions, to illustrate the free agency and responsibility of man. The fragment, which remains, compares the reasoning and intellectual faculties of the human mind with the instinct of animals; and infers, from the

ingenious piece, and it shows that this heretic was a man of considerable abilities. Eusebius esteemed him much as an author,⁵ and seems to judge candidly and charitably of him as to religion; for he says that Bardesanes fell into the Valentinian heresy, and afterwards saw the folly of it, and rejected it, but could not entirely shake off all his errors.⁶ He was one of those who admitted two principles, the one good, and the other evil; and from him the Manichæans borrowed some of their

differing laws, religions, and habits of different countries, an innate power in man of making his choice between them. That the mind is wholly uninfluenced by any physical force or necessity, is also inferred from the resolution with which Christians, in defiance of the severest persecution, resist the commission of anything opposed to the precepts of Christ. The treatise was addressed to the Emperor M. Antoninus, and therefore written not later than the early part of A. D. 180. At what period of his life, and under what circumstances, he enlisted in the ranks of heresy, there is no means of ascertaining; nor is it just to impute to him, at any time, all the absurdities of the Valentinians. His tenets are explained at length in a dialogue *de recta in Deum fide*, ascribed to Origen, but, in all probability, written in the fourth century. Thence it appears, that he received all the books of the Old and New Testaments, though with the addition, according to Epiphanius, of certain apocryphal books; that he unequivocally asserted the unity of the Godhead; and that he believed in the co-operation of the *Logos*, or Son of God, with the Father, in the creation of the world. Misconception respecting the origin of evil, suggested by his devotion to the Chaldæan philosophy (Euseb. Pr. Ev. vi. 9), was the groundwork of all his errors. In order to account for this imaginary inconsistency with the supreme perfection of the Divine attributes, he maintained that the Devil was a *self-existent* being, αὐτοφύη καὶ αὐτογέννητον (Orig. c. Marc. § 3), and opposed to the benevolent purposes of the Creator. To his independent agency he referred the corruption of human nature; man being reduced into sin, and the soul thereupon removed from its æthereal tenement into a gross carnal body. To redeem mankind Christ came; a man in appearance only, and partaking in nowise of the substance of the Virgin Mary: διὰ Μαρίας, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ Μαρίας (Orig. c. Marc. § 3). He affirmed also that there was no resurrection of the body; but that true Christians would ascend to heaven with *another* body of a spiritual and imperishable essence; and this opinion he grounded upon 1 Cor. xv. 37. *Thou sowest not that body which shall be.* Of the sincerity of his early attachment to Christianity, the following anecdote, related by Epiphanius, affords a pleasing testimony. Being urged to renounce the faith in order to avoid persecution, he replied, "I am not afraid of death, which I shall not escape, even were I not to disobey the emperor." (Epiph. Hær. 56. Euseb. H. E. iv. 30). He died about the year 220; leaving behind him a son named *Harmonius*, who inherited the talents, and adopted the opinions, of his father. (Sozom. H. E. iii. 16. Theod. Hær. Fab. i. 22.)—EDIT.

⁵ Jerome also esteemed him highly. [Of the *Dialogue de Fato* more especially, he speaks in terms of the most unqualified approbation, eulogises his eloquence and learning, and describes him as one, *cujus etiam Philosophi admirantur ingenium.* (Vir. Ill. c. 33)—EDIT.]

⁶ Hist. Eccl. iv. 30.

notions. The author of the *Recognitions*⁷ has pillaged Bardesanes, and has put his remarks and his arguments against astrological fate into the mouth of his pretended Clemens; but honour and probity are not to be expected from such writers. *Cave* had a suspicion that Bardesanes was himself the author of the *Recognitions*. I am inclined to have a better opinion of him, and to think that he could not be the author of so many shameless lies.⁸

In those days lived *Melito*, Bishop of Sardis. He is thought by some to have been a prophet. Amongst many treatises which are lost, he wrote one concerning *prophecy*. Eusebius⁹ says that there was καὶ λόγος αὐτοῦ περὶ προφητείας, which Valesius rightly translates, *Item alius (liber) de prophetia*. But in his notes he says, “*Rufinus hæc cum verbis superioribus conjunxit, hoc modo: De fide et generatione Christi, et de prophetia ejus. Cui tamen non assentior. Rectius Hieronymus in libro de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis hunc locum ita vertit: Item de prophetia sua librum unum. Certe Melitonem prophetam a plerisque habitum fuisse docet Tertullianus. Hieronymus in Melitone, Hujus, inquit, elegans et declamatorium ingenium laudans Tertullianus, in septem libris quos scripsit adversus Ecclesiam pro Montano, dicit a plerisque nostrorum prophetam putari.*” All this amounts to little or nothing, and will not prove that Melito was a prophet. If he had made any predictions, Eusebius would have taken notice of them. As a *prophet* means sometimes an *inspired teacher*, in that sense Melito might have been a prophet, and the ancient Christians accounted him one. Polycrates, a bishop of the second century, says of him, τὸν ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πολιτευσάμενον; and of a daughter of Philip, ἐν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι πολιτευσαμένη.¹ But these are expressions somewhat *vague*, and which admit of *more or less*.²

⁷ Recog. ix. 18.

⁸ See an account of this Philosopher, of his accomplishments, and of his errors, in Beausobre, *Hist. du Manichéisme*, ii. p. 128.

⁹ Euseb. iv. 26.

¹ Apud Euseb. v. 24.

² Concerning this illustrious bishop and apologist, see Disc. i. on the Christ. Rel. p. 56.

[Though the fact is certainly open to question, still the testimony of Polycrates, Tertullian, and Jerome, render it highly probable that Melito was endued with the gift of prophecy. There can be little doubt, at all events, from the terms in which he is mentioned, that he was continually employed in advancing the interests of the church, in defending the purity of her doctrine, and in maintaining the strictness

Under Commodus, the Christians suffered little, and many considerable and wealthy families were converted.³

XVII. OF THE MONTANISTS, AND TERTULLIAN.

ABOUT the year 171, arose the sect of the *Montanists*; a sect pretending to prophecy and extraordinary illuminations, and to excessive rigour in doctrine, discipline, and practice. It consisted, as we may suppose, of some hypocrites, mixed with several enthusiasts; and *Tertullian* was easily drawn in to side with them.⁴ They were accused by hasty and credulous adversaries of abominations from which they were free; of killing and eating children;—calumnies which only served to confirm them in their obstinacy and in their errors. This sect, though it spread itself much for a time, did some service perhaps to Christianity; for it produced in its opposers, even for the very sake and pleasure of contradiction, an anti-fanatical spirit; a prudence in avoiding danger when it might be lawfully shunned, a charitable disposition towards repenting sinners, a caution not to be imposed upon by impudent or frantic pretences to inspiration, and a dislike of superstitious and uncommanded austerities, though these indeed some time after overwhelmed the Christian world like a torrent.

of her discipline. It was in this spirit that he took part in the controversy respecting the time of keeping Easter, which was at the height during his episcopacy; and that he travelled into Palestine, at the instigation of his friend Onesimus, for the purpose of settling the canon of the Old Testament. His *Catalogue* is still in existence (Euseb. H. E. iv. 26); and it is the *first*, which is to be found in any Christian writer. It has been seen already that he also addressed an *Apology* for Christianity to the Emperor Aurelius (A. D. 177); of which the few fragments preserved by Eusebius are sufficient to make us regret its loss, as well as that of the rest of his writings. Of these the titles of no less than sixty-six remain; and it is clear from the variety of subjects discussed, that he must have been a man of varied learning and deep research. By some he has been regarded as the angel of the church of Sardis, to whom the Apocalyptic letter is addressed (Rev. iii. 1); but, as this supposition would extend his continuance in the see to a period of more than seventy years, it may fairly be abandoned as a vague conjecture. Of the time and manner of his death nothing is known: but it is left on record by Polycrates (Euseb. H. E. v. 24), that “he lies buried in Sardis, awaiting the visitation from heaven, wherein he shall arise from the dead.”—EDIT.] ³ Euseb. H. E. v. 2.

⁴ For every information respecting the life and writings of *Tertullian*, and his opinions before and after his lapse into Montanism, it is merely necessary to refer both the student and the ordinary reader to the learned and judicious volume of Bishop Kaye.—EDIT.

Besides Tertullian's own vehement and rigid disposition, the ill usage which he received from the Ecclesiastics of the church of Rome contributed to make him a Montanist, as Jerome says.⁵ This may be true; and it may be a mistake: for how should Jerome know Tertullian's motives? Thus however he lost the title of *Saint*;—a title which hath been often as wretchedly bestowed as other titles and favours. Charity bids us suppose that he lost not what is infinitely more important. Several have thought too hardly concerning him, never considering that, with all his abilities, he was deficient in judgment, and had a partial disorder in his understanding; which excuses almost as much as downright frenzy. He was learned, for those times; acute and ingenious, and somewhat satirical; hasty, credulous, impetuous, rigid and censorious, fanatical and enthusiastical; and a bad writer, as to style, not perhaps through incapacity of doing better, but through a false taste and a perverse affectation.⁶ He fell into many errors; but it is to be hoped that, in another world, the mistakes, as well as the doubts, of poor mortals are rectified, and forgiven too; and that whosoever loves truth and virtue,

— illic postquam se lumine vero
Implevit, stellasque vagas miratus et astra
Fixa polo, vidit quanta sub nocte jaceret
Nostra dies.

But the manner in which he treated some of those heretics whom he attacks, is not to be excused. In his books against *Marcion*, he declaims against the very country in which he supposed him to have been born, and calls him, by way of reproach, a *sailor*, or *waterman*, and a *Scythian*. He should have remembered, as Beausobre observes, that Peter the Apostle was a fisherman, and the Scythian Anacharsis a philosopher; and that such reflections are good for nothing.

Tertullian informs us that a Christian, called *Proculus*, cured the emperor Severus of some distemper with oil; for which the emperor was favourable to the Christians, and kept Proculus, as long as he lived, in the palace.⁷ Was this cure miraculous?

⁵ Invidiâ et contumeliis Clericorum Ecclesiæ Romanæ ad Montani dogma delapsus.—*De Script. Eccl.*

⁶ M. de Balzac dit que l'obscurité de Tertullien est comme la noirceur de l'ébène, qui jette un grand éclat.—*Menagiana*.

⁷ Ipse etiam Severus, pater Antonini, Christianorum memor fuit; nam et Procu-

Instead of making a direct answer to the question, we will supply the reader with some facts relating to it, which ought to be taken into consideration.

1. Tertullian seems to have thought the cure miraculous; for he joins it to other cures of that kind, which, as he says, were wrought by Christians.⁸

2. The relation of Tertullian, as to the cure, must be admitted, since he is so circumstantial, and part of his account is confirmed by Pagan writers. It appears that there was such a man as *Euhodus*, who was a *libertus* of the Emperor Severus, and by him appointed to educate his eldest son, Caracalla. Proculus was steward to this *Euhodus*, or *Euhodeas*, or to *Euhodea*, who might be the daughter of *Euhodus*.⁹ Caracalla had a Christian nurse, and a Christian boy for a play-fellow; and it is probable that *Euhodus*, or *Euhodea*, was a Christian, as well as Proculus.

3. Tertullian and Severus were not only contemporaries, but countrymen, and Africans; and Tertullian, who seems also to have been very curious and inquisitive, might know more particularities concerning the emperor than many other people.

4. It had been a custom with Christians, in the apostolical age, to anoint the sick with oil, and to pray over them; after which

lum Christianum, qui Torpacion cognominabatur, Euhodeæ procuratorem, qui eum per oleum aliquando curaverat, requisivit, et in palatio suo habuit ad mortem ejus: quem et Antoninus optime noverat, lacte Christiano educatus.—*Ad Scap.* iv.

⁸ Hæc omnia tibi et officio suggeri possunt, et ab iisdem advocatis, qui et ipsi beneficia habent Christianorum, licet adclament quæ volunt. Nam et ejusdam Notarius, cum a dæmone præcipitaretur, liberatus est; et quorundam propinquus et puerulus. Et quanti honesti viri, de vulgaribus enim non dicimus, aut a dæmoniis aut valetudinibus remediati sunt! Ipse etiam Severus, &c.

⁹ See Tillemont, *H. des Emp.* iii. 89, and *H. Eccl.* iii. 114, and Fabricius, *Bibl. Gr.* viii. 460. In the passage of Tertullian concerning Proculus, S. Basnage for *Euhodeæ* reads *Euhodi*; and for *Torpacion*, *Torpeion*; and thus explains the place;—*Hæc ergo est mens Tertulliani. Cum Severus miraculum a Proculo fuisse editum, ex Euhodo per oleum sanato comperisset, hunc requisivit Proculum, quem et in palatio suo habuit usque ad mortem ejus.*—*Annal.* ii. p. 201. Thus he supposes that Proculus cured *Euhodus*, and not Severus. Fleury, in his *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, gives the same interpretation to the words of Tertullian. But this interpretation seems to do some violence to the words, and is not the most obvious sense, and *eum* is more naturally referred to the emperor. Besides, the expression *memor fuit*, and the affection and kindness which the emperor showed to this man, make it probable that he himself had been cured by him.

I know not whether it be mentioned in the three first centuries, except this passage of Tertullian be allowed a proof of it, or the authority of the *Constitutions* be admitted in this particular: yet it is probable that the practice was continued. Many medical uses of oil were very well known before that time, as may be seen in Pliny's *Natural History*;¹ and the state of physic in the days of Severus was flourishing enough; and Galen lived then, and was in high esteem. If oil had been thought proper for his distemper, Severus would probably have known it without the advice of Proculus. The case seems to have been somewhat extraordinary and not accounted curable by oil; since Severus was so fond of the Christian who recovered him, and took him into the palace, perhaps that he might have him at hand, if he should want him for himself or his family.

5. Severus kept medicines by him, which he used to bestow on those who stood in need of them, and it is said that many persons had found them beneficial in dangerous diseases and disorders. Some Emperors before Severus had done the same.²

6. Severus was for a time very favourable to the Christians, though afterward upon some disgust he used them ill. He was haughty, cruel, stubborn, and unrelenting. He was *vere Pertinax*, *vere Severus*, as the common people used to say of him, alluding to his names. If he had been obstinately bent upon subverting Christianity, he would have proved a most terrible enemy; but the remembrance of the service which he had received from a Christian, and the dutiful behaviour of the Christians, who had never been in arms against him, or assisted his rivals, and other motives, might have contributed to make him less violent: for if Spartian inform us right, his decree was thus; *Judæos fieri sub gravi pœna vetuit: idem etiam de Christianis sanxit*. This might be interpreted as only prohibiting the Jews and Christians to make any more converts, and the Pagans to embrace either of those religions. Many writers suppose that his persecution was sharp; but Dodwell³ thinks

¹ Lib. ii. p. 308, &c. Ed. Hard.

² See Galen, *de Theriac*.

³ In his Dissertation, *de Paucitate Martyrum*; in which, if he sometimes falls short of the truth, yet he approaches nearer to it than his antagonists, who greatly overshoot it in their notions *de Multitudine Martyrum*, and in the regard which they pay to *lying Legends*.

that it was not rigorous, and the writer *de Martibus Persecutorum* passes it over in silence, as though it had not been considerable.

Thus stands the evidence, from which the reader may draw what conclusion he thinks proper. He may also examine these points:—1. Was Proculus a Presbyter? 2. Whether he was or was not, could he anoint a *Pagan* with oil, in pursuance of the direction given by St. James? ⁴ 3. Or was it in imitation of the common practice of the Jews, or of the disciples whom Christ sent to preach.⁵ In the *Constitutions*, there is a form of consecrating water and oil, in which the Bishop or the Presbyter prays that God would give to each of them, δύναμιν ὑγείας ἐμποιητικὴν, νόσων ἀπελαστικὴν, δαιμόνων φυγαδευτικὴν, πάσης ἐπιβουλῆς διωκτικὴν.⁶

In the persecution under Severus, many fled to avoid it, or gave money to redeem themselves. Tertullian, like a frantic Montanist, condemned these expedients.⁷ One Rutilius, distrusting his own courage, made use of them both; but afterwards being seized, he endured cruel torments and death with great constancy and intrepidity, leaving an excellent example of prudence and piety.

XVIII. OF THEOPHILUS.

THEOPHILUS wrote three books, and addressed them to his

⁴ James v. 14.

⁵ Mark vi. 13.

⁶ Const. Apost. viii. 29. [Anointing with oil in cases of sickness was in common use among the Jews, and indeed among the ancients generally; and it is recommended by *Celsus*, *Galen*, and *Hippocrates*, as having a soothing effect upon the body. It was used not only in wounds, as in the instance of the Jew relieved by the good Samaritan (Luke x. 34); but, according to Josephus (B. J. i. 33. 5), the physician gave directions, in Herod's last illness, ἐλαίῳ θερμῷ πᾶν ἀναθάλλει τὸ σῶμα. See also Ps. cix. 18; Isai. i. 8. Among profane writers, there are allusions to the practice in *Æsch. Prom.* 489. *Pind. Pyth.* iv. 393. *Theocr. Idyl.* xi. 2. With respect to the direction given by St. James, it is a question, whether it was used in the early church as a remedy, which, though uncertain in human hands, might be rendered effectual by the prayer of faith; or whether it was merely employed as symbolical of that *oil of gladness*, which they imparted to the sufferer. The latter seems to be the more probable opinion; not only because it was not pointed out as a remedy by Christ, but because it was frequently used as a religious emblem both by Jews and Christians. See 2 Cor. i. 21. 1 John ii. 20, 27. It is needless to say that the custom gives no sanction to the Romish sacrament of *extreme unction*, which is only administered to patients whose recovery is hopeless. See Bishop Kaye on Tertullian, p. 455.—EDIT.]

⁷ De Fuga, cc. 5, 6.

friend *Autolycus*, a learned Pagan, A.D. 168.⁸ He thus disputes with him concerning the doctrine of the resurrection. *Show me*, said Autolycus, *even one man raised from the dead, that I may see and believe.*⁹ Autolycus, in all probability, had no thoughts of calling in good earnest upon his friend, or upon any of the Christians, to perform such a miracle; but like the generality of the Gentiles, accounted the future resurrection of the dead, expected by the Christians, to be an idle fancy and an utter impossibility, a hope without ground and without example, and the resurrection of Christ to be a fable: therefore, said he, give me an instance, and show me one man at least who hath been restored to life. Observe that this was a common argument in the mouth of the Pagans:¹ and let us see what Theophilus replies.

⁸ Theophilus was sixth bishop, and probably a native, of Antioch; and the date in the text (A. D. 168) is that of his elevation to the see, in the eighth year of Marcus Antoninus, as given in the Chronicle of Eusebius. It could not be that of the *Libri ad Autolycum*, his only remaining work of which the genuineness is undisputed; since there is internal evidence that it was not completed till after the death of Aurelius in 180; and as Theophilus himself died in the following year, it was probably published early in 181. Some have thought that he was originally a Jew; but from his own account (L. i. p. 78) it should seem that he was a convert from Paganism. Autolycus challenged him to a defence of the faith which he had adopted; and on one occasion more especially had exultingly demanded, *Show me thy God*. This reply was the result; and the work, which is written, in an elegant, though somewhat diffuse, style, evinces a perfect acquaintance with the literature and mythology of the Greeks, as well as a vast store of general knowledge and much research. Eusebius (H. E. iv. 24) and Jerome (Vir. Ill. c. 25) mentions several treatises, of which he was the author; in one of which he seems to have instituted a discussion respecting the power of the Devil, and observes that the word *δράκων* is applied to him, *διὰ τὸ δεδρακέναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. He wrote also a work against Marcion; and another against Hermogenes; and compiled a *Harmony of the Gospels*, from which Jerome (Epist. 151) has cited a curious exposition of the parable of the *Unjust Steward*.—EDIT.

⁹ Theoph. ad Autol. i. 13. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀρνεῖσθαι σε νεκροὺς ἐγείρεσθαι· φῆς γὰρ· δεῖξόν μοι κἂν ἓνα ἐγερθέντα ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἵνα ἰδὼν πιστεύσω. Πρῶτον μὲν τί μέγα, εἰ θεασάμενος τὸ γεγονός πιστεύσεις; Εἴτα πιστεύεις μὲν Ἑρακλέα, καύσαντα ἑαυτὸν, ζῆν· καὶ Ἀσκληπιδὸν κεραυνωθέντα ἐγηγέρθαι· τὰ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ σοι λεγόμενα ἀπιστεῖς; ἴσως καὶ ἐπιδείξω σοι νεκρὸν ἐγερθέντα καὶ ζῶντα, καὶ τοῦτο ἀπιστήσεις. Ὁ μὲν οὖν Θεός σοι πολλὰ τεκμήρια ἐπιδείκνυσιν εἰς τὸ πιστεῦειν αὐτῷ· εἰ γὰρ βούλει, κατανόησον τὴν μὲν καιρῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν καὶ νυκτῶν τελευτήν, πῶς καὶ αὐτὰ τελευτᾷ καὶ ἀνίσταται.—Μὴ οὖν ἀπίσται, ἀλλὰ πίστευε· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἠπίστουν τοῦτο ἔσεσθαι, ἀλλὰ νῦν κατανοήσας αὐτὰ πιστεύω, ἅμα καὶ ἐπιτυχὼν ἱεραῖς γραφαῖς τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, οἱ καὶ προεῖπον διὰ Πνεύματος Θεοῦ τὰ προγεγονότα ᾧ τρόπῳ γέγονε, καὶ τὰ ἐνεστῶτα τίνι τρόπῳ γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἐπερχόμενα ποίᾳ τάξει ἀπαρτισθήσεται.

¹ *Tanta ætas abiit*, says Cæcilius, in Minucius Felix (c. 11) *secula innumera fluxerunt*:

1. *What great thing would it be, if you should give credit to what you have beheld?* Theophilus here seems to have thought upon the words of Christ. *Because thou hast seen, thou hast believed, &c.*²

2. *You who are so incredulous, can yet imagine that Hercules lives, and that Æsculapius was raised after death.* To this Autolycus would perhaps have replied, "My friend, let me tell you a secret; I believe no more of the matter than you do: but though I should think that the souls of these two heroes became gods after their death, what is that to the resurrection which you Christians expect?" If Autolycus really believed such things, he had much more credulity than the Roman Publicans. *An Amphiaraus Deus erit, et Trophonius? Nostri quidem publicani, quum essent agri in Bæotia Deorum immortalium excepti lege censoria, negabant immortales esse ullos, qui aliquando homines fuissent.*³ Supposing him to have admitted popular Paganism, and rejected Christianity, Theophilus might have told him, that he *strained at a gnat, and swallowed a camel.*

3. *If you will not believe the testimony of God, I question whether you would believe, though I should show you a person raised from the dead.* Theophilus had in his mind, *If they believe not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.*⁴

4. *The death and resurrection of the seasons of the year, of day and night, of the sun and moon, of seeds and fruits, &c., are figures and divine indications of the resurrection which we expect.*

5. *I, who was a Pagan, and an unbeliever like you, now believe a resurrection; being induced to it by the indications of it which I have mentioned, and by the Prophets, whose writings*

quis unus ullus ab inferis vel Protesilai sorte remeavit, horarum saltem permissio commeatu, vel ut exemplo crederemus? So in Lactantius, Div. Inst. vii. 22: — *Illud reponitur, Tot jam secula transierunt: Quis unquam unus ab inferis resurrexit, ut exemplo ejus fieri posse credamus?* So in Tertullian, Apol. c. 48: *At enim Christianus, si de homine hominem, ipsumque de Caio Caium reducem repromittat, statim illic vesica quæritur: lapidibus magis nec saltem castibus a populo exigetur.* The general purpose of which, though some of the expressions be obscure and perhaps corrupted, is plainly this; that if a Christian speaks of the certainty of a resurrection, he is presently treated by the Pagans as a knave, or a fool, or a madman. Speaking of a resurrection and a future judgment, he adds: Apol. c. 18, *Hæc et nos risimus aliquando. De vestris fuimus.*

² John xx. 29.

³ Cicero, de Nat. Deor. iii.

⁴ Luke xvi. 31.

show that they were inspired of the Holy Ghost, and had the knowledge of things past, present, and future. Theophilus by the Prophets meant not only the writers of the Old but of the New Testament, and immediately subjoins some passages taken from St. Paul's Epistles.

From all this it must, I think, be acknowledged that Theophilus never saw a man raised from the dead. If he had, it would have so affected him, that he could not have avoided the mentioning it, and would have urged it to his friend, whom he was desirous to confute and convert, and who would surely have paid some degree of regard to his testimony. At least he would have mentioned it as a reason for his own belief, and a motive to himself to continue stedfast in all the doctrines of Christianity, and particularly in the doctrine of a resurrection;—a reason and a motive stronger surely than the return of seasons, and the setting and rising of the sun. *Soles occidere et redire possunt, &c.* Instead of saying, I myself have seen it, he talks of the small merit in believing what one beholds, and of the reasonableness of assenting to inspired men without such overbearing evidence. It is probable, from his silence, that he had heard of no instance of such a miracle in his days; probable, I say, but not certain: because, though he had heard of it, he might possibly have thought it to no purpose to tell his friend that there were Christians who affirmed such things; and he might suspect that Autolycus would not have admitted the testimony of persons, with whom he had no acquaintance, and for whom he had little regard.

Theophilus makes no mention of any miracles, except the casting out dæmons, not even of the miracles of Christ and his Apostles; which is strange: and when he speaks of curing the dæmoniacs, it is with a sort of moderation and reserve.⁵ This is done, says he, *sometimes, even still.* Is that all he had to say? And yet some will have it that dæmoniacs and resurrections were as common in those days as fevers and palsies. It must be confessed that his books are not drawn up in a manner altogether proper to convince unbelievers.

Clemens Romanus, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Tatian, Minucius

⁵ Theoph. ad Autol. ii. p. 87. Οἱ δαιμονῶντες ἐνίοτε καὶ μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο ἐξορκίζονται. — καὶ ὁμολογεῖ τὰ πλάνα πνεύματα εἶναι δαίμονες.

Felix, and others, when they treat the same subject,—the doctrine of a resurrection,—mention no resurrections in their days to confirm it; but Clemens mentions the resurrection of Christ.

As Theophilus was disputing with a Pagan about the resurrection, he might have told him that the thing had not appeared impossible to some Pagans, and have referred him to a remarkable passage in Plato: ἐκ τῶν τετελευτηκότων αὐτῶν, κειμένων δὲ ἐν γῇ, πάλιν ἐκεῖ ξυνισταμένους καὶ ἀναβιωσκομένους. And again: ἐκ γῆς γὰρ ἀνεβιώσκοντο πάντες, οὐδὲν μεμνημένοι τῶν πρόσθεν.⁶ Plato is speaking of an *old history*, παλαιὸν μῦθον. The Athenians could not be surprised at St. Paul's mentioning ἀνάστασις, if they had read Plato.'

It is certain that the most convincing proof of the resurrection which could have been offered to Autolycus, or which Autolycus could have asked, would have been to raise a dead man before his eyes: but in this kind of dialogues, real or fictitious, we are not to suppose that the Pagan always said what was most suitable, and that the Christian always replied in the most pertinent manner.⁸

Theophilus⁹ says; Τί μοι λοιπὸν καταλέγειν τὰ περὶ Ποσειδῶνος, καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος, ἢ Διονύσου καὶ Ἡρακλέος, Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς φιλοκόλπου, καὶ Ἀφροδίτης τῆς ἀναισχύντου; κ. τ. λ. The epithet φιλοκόλπου ought to have been explained by the Editors. Theophilus means the *Ephesian Diana*, *Diana πολύμαστος*, who is represented with a multitude of breasts one above another, and makes an ugly figure, more like a she-devil than a goddess.¹ Theophilus should rather have called her Ἀρτεμις than Ἀθηνᾶ, but the Pagans confounded their deities together, and made their Ceres, Diana, Hecate, Isis, Proserpina, Minerva, to be one and the same; and thence came the *Symbolic* and *Pantheistic* images of gods and goddesses, representing the attributes of several deities.

⁶ Polit. p. 271, 272.

⁷ See the passage of Minucius cited above, and some Pagan stories of resurrections in the notes of Davies; and Grotius, de Ver. R. C. ii. § 7, 10, and Bayle's Dict. in *Theopompe*, Not. L.

⁸ This is a sad begging of the question.—EDIT.

⁹ Ad Aut. iii. 3.

¹ Diana Ephesia, mammis multis et veribus [*uberibus*] exstructa.—Min. F. c. 21, where see Davies.

XIX. OF IRENÆUS.

CONTEMPORARY with Theophilus was IRENÆUS,² who gives us an account of miracles wrought in the church; as healing the

² IRENÆUS received his education under the venerable Polycarp; and his birth is assigned from this circumstance to the year 120, and by Dodwell placed as far back as 97. Since however, he describes himself as *παῖς ἔτι ὢν*, and his instructor as *πάνυ γηραλέος* (Epist. ad Flor. et Hær. iii. 4), during his residence at Smyrna; and since the martyrdom of Polycarp did not take place until the year 169; those critics are probably nearer the mark who suppose that he was born in or about the year 140. To the benefit which he derived from the lessons of the aged bishop he repeatedly alludes, and dwells with fond delight on his youthful recollections. Subsequently he became the pupil of Papias; and he speaks of certain elders, who had conversed with the disciples of Christ, from whom he had derived no inconsiderable knowledge of divine things. Hence the purity of doctrine, and thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures, which characterise his writings; and that unaffected piety and fervent charity, which formed the distinguishing feature of his character. Under the episcopacy of *Pothinus*, we find him a presbyter of the church of Lyons in Gaul; and on the death of that prelate, who was numbered among the martyrs who suffered at Lyons and Vienne during the persecution under Aurelius, he was appointed to succeed him in that see (A. D. 177). It has been thought that he was the writer of the celebrated epistle from the Gallic churches to those of Asia, detailing the horrors of the persecution to which they were exposed; but Eusebius and Jerome are silent on the subject, and the style of the letter (Euseb. H. E. v. 4) is so much more elegant than that of Irenæus, that such a supposition is scarcely probable. This Epistle indeed has ever been justly regarded as one of the most beautiful productions of Christian antiquity. It breathes, throughout, a spirit of pious resignation; and describes so pathetically the heroic firmness of the martyrs, the contrition and subsequent fortitude of some who had recanted from fear of torture, and the brutal violence of their persecutors, that it cannot be read without emotion even at the present day. Under the most exaggerated tortures, inflicted without respect to sex, or age, or infirmity, the victims were anxious only to support their weaker brethren; while their unvaried reply to the repeated questions of their tormentors was, *Χριστιανός εἰμι· καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν οὐδὲν φαῦλον γίνεται*.

No sooner had Irenæus been invested with the episcopal dignity, than he diligently applied himself to settle the disordered state of the church; sending missionaries into the distant provinces with the view of making new converts, confirming the brethren, and opposing the spread of heresies which had now become a subject of considerable alarm. Hence he is called by Theodoret, *Lumen Gallorum occidentalium*. By the defection of his friend Florinus, who had studied with him under Polycarp, he was very sensibly affected; and he addressed a letter to him in the hope of reclaiming him from the errors into which he had fallen. A fragment of this Epistle, in which he discusses the *monarchy* or *unity* of God, and proves that he is not the author of evil, is preserved by Eusebius (H. E. v. 20). He wrote also a letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome, in the name of the Christians of Gaul; urging him to desist from violent measures, and to bear with those who conscientiously differed from him on the subject of the Easter controversy, which had now assumed, at least on one side, an angry and uncharitable character (Euseb. H. E. iv. 14; v. 24). His inter-

sick, casting out devils, speaking various languages, raising the dead, &c. It has been hitherto taken for granted on all sides, that he speaks of all these miracles, as being performed in his days. Therefore Dr. Middleton has laboured to invalidate his testimony, and to show that he was a weak, credulous, and injudicious man; and I fear it will be no easy task to clear him entirely from the imputation of credulity and inaccuracy.³ But

ference had the desired effect; and it has been well remarked that the part which he took in assuaging this unhappy discord, proves him to have been indeed, and not in name only, *a lover of peace*. The time of his death is unknown. It has been said that he suffered martyrdom under Severus (A. D. 202); but on authority of very little weight.

With respect to the charge of credulity, from which Jortin is scarcely prepared to defend him, it is observable that, like other fathers of the second and third century, he speaks of the existence of miraculous powers in general terms; rarely alleging any specific instance of their exercise, and none but reported cases of diseases cured and dæmons ejected, which are of all others especially open to misapprehension or fraud. Although it is manifestly impossible to fix the period at which miracles ceased to be wrought in the primitive church, there is no positive evidence of their prevalence after the age of the Apostles and their immediate successors; and the most probable opinion seems to be that which limits the gift of supernatural energy to those, upon whom the Apostles themselves had conferred it by the imposition of hands. See Bishop Kaye, on Tertullian, xcvi. 102.

The work, upon which the fame of Irenæus principally rests, is his *Treatise against Heresies*. With the exception of the greater part of the first book, and a few occasional fragments of the other four, the Greek original is unfortunately lost; but the whole is extant in a very ancient Latin version. According to this translation, it was directed generally *contra Hereses*; but the subversion of the Gnostic heresy, as brought to perfection by *Valentinus*, was mainly contemplated by the writer; and in the Greek title, which is preserved by Eusebius and Photius, the work is designated, in allusion to a phrase of St. Paul (1 Tim. vi. 20), *A refutation of knowledge falsely so called* (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. v. 7, Ἐλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδογνώσεως). In conformity with this title, it describes and exposes the various forms which Gnosticism had assumed, from its origin with Simon Magus to the period at which the work was written. From the imperfect state in which it now exists, it is scarcely possible to judge of its style and character; but the Translation, though rude and unpolished, is energetic and vigorous. Irenæus states his arguments with clearness and precision; and he evinces throughout an intimate acquaintance with his subject, and an unbiassed solidity of judgment, which gives no little weight to his authority.—EDIT.

³ The credulity and inaccuracy of the Christians of those times permit us not to trust to their relations, especially when they contain anything preternatural. One cannot help wishing that they had been more circumspect and less credulous; but perhaps Providence would not preserve them from these errors and defects, that it might plainly appear, that they were men in no manner comparable to the first disciples of Jesus Christ, and consequently altogether incapable of forging the books of the New Testament.—Le Clerc. Bibl. A. et M. xxiii. p. 27.

on considering the words of Irenæus, a conjecture offered itself to me, which may perhaps deserve notice. Irenæus, writing against heretics, observes that they never had miraculous gifts amongst them, and thereby might be distinguished from the disciples of Christ. Then he proceeds to speak of the miracles performed by the latter, mixing those which had been wrought by the Apostles and their immediate successors with those which, in his opinion, and according to common report, still continued in the Church. When he speaks of *resurrections*, he says, “the soul *returned*, the dead *were raised*, and *remained* σὺν ἡμῖν, *with us*,”⁴ that is, *with us Christians*; but he fixes not the time when they were recalled to life, and were to be seen. It is not evident therefore, even upon his own account of it, that the dead were raised, or remained alive at the time he wrote. It is remarkable that when he speaks of casting out devils, healing the sick, and other miracles, he uses the *present tense*, ἐπιτελοῦσιν, ἐλαύνουσιν, ἰῶνται, &c: but when he mentions *resurrections*, he has the caution *always* to use the *aorist*, ἐπέστέρψεν, ἐχαρίσθη, ἠγέρθησαν, παρέμειναν.

Irenæus says that the dead were raised and remained alive for some years: and Quadratus, who wrote his Apology about fifty years before him, speaks thus:—Τοῦ δὲ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν τὰ ἔργα ἀεὶ παρῆν, ἀληθῆ γὰρ ἦν· οἱ θεραπευθέντες, οἱ ἀναστάντες ἐκ νεκρῶν· οἱ οὐκ ὤφθησαν μόνον θεραπευόμενοι, καὶ ἀνιστάμενοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀεὶ παρόντες· οὐδὲ ἐπιδημοῦντος μόνον τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπαλλαγέντος, ἦσαν ἐπὶ χρόνον ἱκανόν· ὥστε καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους χρόνους τινὲς αὐτῶν ἀφίκοντο.⁵ Both of them use the same word:—χρόνον ἱκανόν, says Quadratus; ἱκανοῖς ἔτεσι, says Irenæus. Did Irenæus copy Quadratus?⁶

⁴ Nūn dici potest de re quæ ætate nostra facta est, idemque valet ac τὸ καθ' ἡμᾶς, quod Eusebius usurpare solet de rebus multo ante gestis; ut cum dicit de Porphyrio philosopho ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς γενόμενος. Justinus de Antinoo ita loquitur, τοῦ νῦν γενομένου, qui nostra ætate vixit.—Valesius ab Euseb. iv. 8.

⁵ Apud Euseb. iv. 3.

⁶ Iren. Hær. ii. 57. Τοσοῦτον δὲ ἀποδέουσι τοῦ νεκρὸν ἐγείρειν, καθὼς ὁ Κύριος ἠγειρε, καὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι διὰ προσευχῆς· καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀδελφότητι πολλάκις, διὰ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον τῆς κατὰ τόπον ἐκκλησίας πάσης αἰτησαμένης μετὰ νηστείας καὶ λιτανείας πολλῆς, ἐπέστρεψε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ τετελευτηκότος, καὶ ἐχαρίσθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ταῖς εὐχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων.—Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸν Κύριον φαντασιωδῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα πεποιηκέναι φήσουσιν, ἐπὶ τὰ προφητικὰ ἀνάγοντες αὐτοὺς, ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπιδείξομεν πάντα οὕτως περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ προειρῆσθαι καὶ γεγονέναι βεβαίως, καὶ αὐτὸν μόνον εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Διὸ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐκείνου ὀνόματι οἱ

Irenæus says that evil spirits were cast out of Pagans, so as to return no more; and that they, who were thus cured, often embraced Christianity. Tertullian⁷ and Origen⁸ affirm the same.

Irenæus says not, as some have imagined, that all Christians could work miracles: he only says, οἱ ἀληθῶς αὐτοῦ μαθηταί, *they who are true disciples of Christ*; which is not the same as πάντες, and only means that none except true Christians had such powers. These learned men⁹ seem to have been misled by the translation of Valesius:—*Unde etiam in ejus nomine, quotquot veri sunt ejus discipuli, acceptā ab eo gratiā.* He had no reason to put in *quotquot*. It should be, *Unde etiam in illius nomine, veri ejus discipuli* etc.¹ The general sense of the

ἀληθῶς αὐτοῦ μαθηταί, παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντες τὴν χάριν, ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἐπ' εὐεργεσίᾳ τῇ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων, καθὼς εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν τὴν δωρεὰν εἴληφε παρ' αὐτοῦ. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ δαίμονας ἐλαύνουσι βεβαίως καὶ ἀληθῶς, ὥστε πολλάκις καὶ πιστεύειν αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους καθαρισθέντας ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπονηρῶν πνευμάτων, καὶ εἶναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· οἱ δὲ καὶ πρόγνωσιν ἔχουσι τῶν μελλόντων, καὶ ὀπτασίας καὶ ῥήσεις προφητικάς· ἄλλοι δὲ τοὺς κάμνοντας διὰ τῆς τῶν χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεως ἰῶνται, καὶ ὑγιεῖς ἀποκαθιστᾶσιν. Ἦδη δὲ, καθὼς ἔφαμεν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἠγέρθησαν, καὶ παρέμειναν σὺν ἡμῖν ἱκανοῖς ἔτεσι. Καὶ τί γάρ; οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμὸν εἰπεῖν τῶν χαρισμάτων, ὧν κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου ἡ ἐκκλησία παρὰ Θεοῦ λαβοῦσα, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, ἐκάστης ἡμέρας ἐπ' εὐεργεσίᾳ τῇ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπιτελεῖ, μήτε ἐξαπατῶσα τινὰς, μήτε ἐξαργυριζομένη. Ὡς γὰρ δωρεὰν εἴληφε παρὰ Θεοῦ, δωρεὰν καὶ διακονεῖ.—Καθὼς καὶ πολλῶν ἀκούομεν ἀδελφῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἔχόντων, καὶ παντοδαπαῖς λαλοῦντων διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος γλώσσαις, καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς φανερόν ἀγόντων ἐπὶ τῷ συμφέροντι, καὶ τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκδιηγουμένων. See also Euseb. H. E. v. 7.

⁷ Ad Scap. iv.

⁸ In Reg.

⁹ What learned men? None have been mentioned. Doubtless, however, those who suppose that Irenæus is speaking of cotemporary miracles.—EDIT.

¹ [The following emendations of the old version of *Irenæus* were added by the author, in an appendix to the first edition.—EDIT.]

Iren. Hær. i. 22. (Ed. Massuet.) :—*Omnia per ipsum fecit Pater, non per angelos, neque per virtutes abscissas ab ejus sententia.*—*Virtutes*, δυνάμεις. For *sententia*, it should perhaps be *substantia*, or *essentia*. *Græce*, οὐσία.—Ibid. *Dicunt* [Basiliḍiani] *non oportere omnino ipsorum mysteria effari, sed in abscondito continere* [pertinere] *per silentium*. Grabe added *pertinere* from two manuscripts, which should be struck out, though it were in two hundred manuscripts. In the Greek it was, we may suppose, ἐν κρυπτῷ κατέχειν διὰ σιγῆς.—i. 24. *Saturninus unum Patrem incognitum omnibus ostendit*. Irenæus wrote ἀπέδειξε, that is, *posuit, constituit, esse docuit*.—i. 25. *Ad detractiōnem divini Ecclesiæ nominis*. So Grabe. The former editions had *ad detractiōnem divini nominis et ecclesiæ*, which was right. *Divinum nomen* is the name of Christ, or of Christianity.—II. 28. p. 158. *Neque nos erubescimus* [or *erubescamus*] *quæ sunt in quæstionibus majora secundum nos reservare Deo*. In Greek it was μείζονα ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς, *the things which are above us, and too high for us*, as in Plato's *Timæus*: περὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων δαιμόνων εἰπεῖν, καὶ γινῶναι τὴν γένεσιν, μείζον ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς.

passage produced here from Irenæus is this:—"Heretics never had any miraculous powers, much less the power of raising the dead: yet this our Lord and his apostles have done; this the brethren have often by their united prayers obtained from God: the dead have been raised, and have continued with us for some years. The true disciples of Christ receive various gifts, and daily impart them as freely as they have received them; some foretel future events, others heal the sick, others expel evil spirits, &c." I suspect that if Irenæus had been called upon to explain himself as to these gifts, and to prove his assertions, he would have said, that the ejecting of dæmons, and the healing the sick, were still performed upon certain occasions; but that the speaking of languages, the disclosing the secrets of men's hearts, and the raising of the dead, had been performed by apostles and apostolical men: and that he had mentioned all these miracles without discrimination of time, as gifts conferred on the faithful, and never on heretics.

In speaking of these miracles he alludes to the New Testament, and talks in the apostolical style:—καθὼς εἰς ἕκαστος αὐτῶν τὴν δωρεὰν εἴληφε παρ' αὐτοῦ.² Again:—μήτε ἐξαπατῶσα τινὰς, μήτε ἐξαργυριζομένη.³ Again:—ὥς γὰρ δωρεὰν εἴληφε παρὰ Θεοῦ, δωρεὰν καὶ διακονεῖ.⁴ Again:—τὰ κρύφια εἰς φανερόν ἀγόντων.⁵

After Irenæus, there is hardly any mention made of the *gift of tongues* in ecclesiastical history. One who has written the life of *Pachomius*, a monk of the fourth century, says, amongst

Euseb. E. H. x. 1, ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ τάδε μείζονα ἢ καθ' ἡμᾶς ὑπάρχειν ὁμολογοῦντες. It should therefore be, *majora quam secundum nos*. The old interpreter of Irenæus translates word for word, without any regard to elegance: but the meanness and closeness of his version helps us often to discover the words of the author.—iii. ii. p. 192. *Quoniam autem sola illa vera et firma, et non capit neque plura præterquam prædicta sunt, neque pauciora esse Evangelia, per tot et tanta ostendimus. Non capit*, that is, οὐκ ἐνδέχεται, *fieri non potest, non oportet*. Tertullian is very fond of this word. See *Apol. c. 17. Quoniam* is ὅτι, *quòd*. iv. 10. *Neque enim varie, neque elate, neque glorians dicit hæc. Varie*, that is, ποικίλως, *subdole, versute*.

² From 1 Pet. iv. 10. ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβε χάρισμα.

³ From 2 Cor. xii. 16. δόλω ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον. Μὴ τινα ὦν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς.

⁴ From Matt. x. 8. δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε.

⁵ From 1 Cor. xiv. 25. καὶ οὕτω τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερά γίνεται.

other things equally marvellous and equally credible, that this saint had received a power to speak all sorts of languages.⁶

As to the ejection of dæmons, mentioned by Irenæus and other Fathers, every one knows how often even the wise and the wary have been deceived in the affair of sorcery, witchcraft, and dæmoniacal operations. The proofs must be very clear and the case easily distinguishable from bodily disorders, or from imposture, before a man should give a full assent to the testimony either of ancient or of modern Christians. The speaking of new languages, as ⁷ before observed, has been supposed one of the marks of a possession. “*Hoc prodigii dæmon imitatione prosecutus est, si creditur Hieronymo in vita Hilarionis: Videres de ore barbaro, et qui Francam tantum et Latinam noverat, Syra ad purum verba resonare. Simile prodigium narratur a Gregorio Magno: Ammonius mihi jam in monasterio positus narravit, quod in ea mortalitate, quæ ⁸ Patrici Narsi temporibus hanc urbem vehementer afflixit, in domo prædicti Valeriani puer armentarius fuit, præcipuæ simplicitatis et humilitatis. Cum vero ejusdem advocati domus eadem clade vastaretur, idem puer percussus est, et ad mortem usque deductus, qui subito sublatus a præsentibus rediit, sibique dominum vocari fecit, cui ait; ‘Ego in cælo fui:—ut vero scias quod me in cælum fuisse verum fateor, ecce accepi illic, ut linguis omnium loquar. Numquid tibi incognitum fuit, Græcam me linguam omnino non nosse, et tamen Græce loquor, ut cognoscas an verum sit quod me omnes linguas accepisse confiteor.’ Cui tunc Græce dominus suus locutus est: atque ita ille in eadem lingua respondit, ut cuncti qui aderant mirarentur. In eadem quoque domo prædicti Narsi Spatarius Vulgar manebat, qui festine ad ægrum deductus, ei Vulgarica lingua locutus est. Sed ita puer ille, in Italia natus et nutritus, in eadem locutione respondit. Quæ si vera sunt, ut vera esse possunt, crediderim non miserum puerum tot linguis imbutum fuisse, at Dæmonem, ut olim serpentis, sic et loquentis lingua, finxisse voces pronuncianti peregrinas. Quippe die tertio infelix ille puer, manus ac brachia, lacertosque suos, dentibus laniavit, atque ita de corpore exivit.”⁹ These things may be true, as*

⁶ See Bollandus, or Tillemont H. E. vii. p. 224.

⁷ See above, p. 13.

⁸ I suppose it should be *Patricii Narsetis* or *Narsis*.

⁹ S. Basnage, Annal. i. p. 424.

Basnage observes; but surely we want better vouchers than Jerome, and Ammonius the monk. We might as well believe, upon the authority of Æsop and Phædrus, that the *fox* and the *cat* held a dialogue together in Greek or in Latin.¹

It is most probable that the *dæmoniacs* described in the New Testament were really possessed.² When the devils went out of the *dæmoniacs*, and entered into the swine, if the disorder of these men was only madness, the sense must be that *the disease*

¹ “The reason for which so many magicians were found amongst the Jews, though they were condemned by the Law of God, was, that the Jews ascribed most diseases, those especially which disturb the understanding and dislocate the limbs, to the malice of *dæmons*, and imagined that such diseases could only be cured by sorcery and incantations. We find in the Gospel that when our Saviour cured the diseased and the possessed, the Jews said that he wrought these miracles by the power and assistance of *dæmons*.” (*Vigneul-Marville*, tom. i. p. 278. His true name was *Dom Bonaventure D’Argonne*, and he was *Prieur de la Chartreuse de Gaillon*. See *Lettres de Bayle*, pp. 666, 708, 869. *Vous avez raison*, says Bayle, *de trouver bon le Mélange de Vigneul-Marville*, &c.)

“There are men of abilities, who respect the authority of the sacred books, and yet know not how to believe that the *dæmoniacs*, mentioned in the Gospels, were tormented by *dæmons*. They are inclined to think that their diseases were natural, but that the causes of them were not known. This opinion gives me no offence. The miracles of our Saviour, upon this supposition, were only so much the greater; since it is much more wonderful to command a disease, than to command a devil to depart instantly, and to be instantly obeyed: besides, our Lord was not sent to rectify the wrong notions which the Jews might entertain concerning these maladies.” Thus Beausobre, in his posthumous remarks on Matt. v. p. 14;—whose sincere attachment to Christianity no man can fairly call in question. Some learned men now living have declared themselves of this opinion, with a very good design, as I firmly believe; but their system is liable to insuperable objections.

In his notes on Mark v., Beausobre is of opinion that the *dæmoniac*, who brake his chains and fetters, must have been assisted by an evil spirit; and that of the *dæmoniacs* mentioned in the Sacred Books, some were really possessed, and others were only afflicted with epilepsies, &c.

“Theosebius, a Pagan philosopher, had a wife who was possessed with a *dæmon*. To deliver her, he at first had recourse to prayers and humble intreaties: but the *dæmon*, who was an opiniatre, made a jest of all this. At last Theosebius conjured him *in the name of the God of the Hebrews*, and called to witness the *Beams of the Sun*. Then the *dæmon* quitted his lodging, protesting that he had a profound respect for all the gods in general, but most particularly for the God of the Hebrews. It is not a Christian who relates this story: it is the philosopher Damascius (apud Phot. Cod. 242. col. 1037.)” Beausobre Hist. de Man. ii. 67.

It would not be right to overlook *Tertullian’s Dæmoniac*. A woman, says he, went to the theatre, and came home possessed by a devil. The exorcist, who endeavoured to cast him out, asked him how he had the assurance to enter into a Christian. Why not? said the *dæmon*: I found her at my own house. *De Spectac.* 26.

² See above, p. 9.

left the men and was transferred to the beasts; and this must have been performed by the immediate act and power of Christ: but if it was a dæmoniacal case, the destruction of the beasts was only by his permission, and by the act and power of the evil spirits. It deserves therefore to be considered, whether a bare permission of our Lord, in this case, be not more consistent with the general character of his mighty works, which were of the merciful and not of the severe kind; and also with the words of the three evangelists, which represent him, not as *acting*, but only as *not hindering*.

As to the dæmoniacs in the following ages, it may be left as a dubious point: dubious, I say; for it is possible that, after the apostolical age, evil spirits might be permitted or commanded by the Supreme Governor to afflict men, and might be obliged to depart at the command of Christians, and at the name of Jesus. It is possible that such interpositions of dæmons might be permitted in one century and in one region, and not in another. The invisible and spiritual and angelical world may undergo many variations, and be subject to different restraints and regulations in different ages, so as to interfere more, or less, or not at all, in human affairs. Thus much in behalf, not of *belief*, but of *academical hesitation*.

Le Clerc, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, has inserted the *Christian Creed*, as it stood in the days of Irenæus:—

“*Ecclesia*,” inquit Irenæus, “*tametsi per totum orbem, usque ad extremos terræ fines, sparsa, ab Apostolis eorumque discipulis fidem accepit, quæ est, I. In unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, qui fecit cælum et terram et mare et omnia quæ in eis sunt; II. Et in unum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei, nostræ salutis causâ incarnatum; III. Et in Spiritum Sanctum, qui per Prophetas œconomias et adventus (Christi) prædicavit, et generationem e Virgine, et per passionem et resurrectionem e mortuis, et cum carne in cælos adsumptionem dilecti Jesu Christi Domini nostri, et e cælo adventum ejus, in gloriâ Patris, ad colligenda omnia, et ad excitandam omnem totius humani generis carnem; IV. Ut Christo Jesu Domino nostro et Servatori et Regi, secundum Patris inconspicui voluntatem, flectatur omne genu cælestium, terrestrium, et inferorum, et omnis lingua ei confiteatur, utque ipse justum judicium in omnibus ferat: spiritualia quidem nequitiae et Angelos transgressores, quique in*

defectione fuerunt, impiosque item homines et injustos et flagitiosos et blasphemos in ignem æternum mittat; justis vero et sanctis, qui præcepta ejus servaverint, et in amore permanserint, seu ab initio, seu post pœnitentiam, vitam gratificatus, immortalitate eos donet, et gloriâ æternâ circumdet."

Hanc confirmat in sequentibus Irenæus fidem per totum terrarum orbem a Christianis unanimi consensu et una voce doceri.—Hinc intelligere est eadem esse omnibus summa Fidei Capita, nec doctos pluribus indigere ad consequendam salutem, quam minus eruditos, neque ad plura admittenda adigi posse. Revelationi, nimirum, ut detrahi nihil potest, sic nec quidquam addere fas est. Ideoque semel constituta Fidei Capita neque augeri, sine nova Revelatione, neque minui possunt. Quod ad animum revocasse oportuisset eos, qui nova Fidei Capita sequentibus sæculis, sine novis ullis a Deo mandatis acceptis, condiderunt.—Ex hac, aliisve id genus priscis Confessionibus, conflatum postea est, quod vocatur Symbolum Apostolorum, ut viri docti ostenderunt.³

Let us add to this, the Creed which is delivered to us by Tertullian:—⁴

Unicum quidem Deum credimus, sub hac tamen dispositione, quam Oeconomiam dicimus, ut unici Dei sit et Filius, Sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine quo factum est nihil; hunc missum a Patre in Virginem, et ex ea natum hominem et Deum, filium hominis et filium Dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christum; hunc passum, hunc mortuum et sepultum, secundum Scripturas, et resuscitatum a Patre, et in cœlos resumptum sedere ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos; qui exinde miserit, secundum promissionem suam, a Patre Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum, sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum.

These are perhaps the two most ancient creeds that are extant;⁵ and not at all the worse for their antiquity.

³ Le Clerc, H. E. p. 651.

⁴ Adv. Praxeas, c. 2.

⁵ Although there is no positive evidence of the fact, it has still been very confidently asserted, from the fourth century downwards, that what is known as the *Apostles' Creed* was really compiled by the Apostles themselves; and even Mosheim (Cent. ii. 2, 3) acknowledges its perfect conformity with what they taught. There was probably no *written* creed in the early Church; so that the uncertainty of oral communication is amply sufficient to account for the slight, and principally verbal, variations, which distinguish the rules of faith, eventually found to obtain in

XX. OF THE INTERVAL BETWEEN IRENÆUS AND ORIGEN.

Towards the end of the second century *Pantænus*, a philosopher and a learned man, went to India to preach the gospel. He is not said to have wrought any miracles there; but it is related that he found Christians in those countries.⁶

different independent churches. Irenæus, indeed, and his predecessors make no express mention of the Apostles' creed; but, from the words and phrases contained in it, which they continually repeat, it is more reasonable to suppose that they enlarged upon its articles, than to regard it, with Le Clerc, as a compilation from the various confessions of faith, which appeared after the Apostolic era. The original Greek Creed of Irenæus will be found in his work *de Hær.* I. 10. i. From the allusion to the *Paraclete* of Montanus, it is clear that the Creed of Tertullian, cited by Jortin, was written after his fall; and there is the same allusion in the similar form, which is given in the tract *de Virginibus velandis* (c. 1). In the *Regula Fidei*, which he lays down in his Treatise *de Præscriptione Hæreticorum* (c. 13), there is no such blemish; so that Tertullian was at the time of its production a true member of the Church of Christ.—EDIT.

⁶ Euseb. H. E. v. 10. [CLEMENT of Alexandria (ap. Euseb. H. E. vi. 13) speaks of *Pantænus* as one of his preceptors in scriptural and traditional knowledge; and for a considerable portion of his life he was at the head of the Catechetical School, which had been established in that city from the time of St. Mark (Jerom. Vir. Ill. i. 36). About A.D. 190, an application was made to the bishop of the see for the assistance of some able and zealous missionary in propagating the gospel in India. *Pantænus* was accordingly selected as the person best qualified for the task; and neither the difficulties nor the dangers of the undertaking, nor his reluctance to quit the scene of his present duties, deterred him from engaging in the mission. Two of the Apostles, Bartholomew and Thomas, had been occupied before him in planting the religion of the Cross in certain parts of the vast continent of India; and he found there, as Eusebius relates, a Hebrew copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, which St. Bartholomew had left there. Jerome says, but solely (as far as can be ascertained) upon his own authority, that *Pantænus* brought this treasure back with him to Alexandria. In the *Vetera Monumenta* of Ciampini (i. 4), there is a Greek inscription, which attests the labours of St. Thomas in those parts; and some interesting remarks on the early progress of the Gospel in India will be found in Le Bas's "*Life of Bishop Middleton*." Of the time, however, that *Pantænus* remained in the East, and of the success of his mission, no account has reached us. On his return he resumed the *Catechetical* class, in which his pupil Clement had been *locum tenens* during his absence; and he continued to discharge his official duties during the remainder of his life. Euseb. H. E. v. 10:—τοῦ κατ' Ἀλεξανδρίαν τελευτῶν ἡγείται διδασκαλίου. Lardner, indeed, translates τελευτῶν ἡγείται, *he was at last made president*; and thence infers a contradiction in a former statement of Eusebius, that his appointment dated from the reign of Commodus; but he has clearly misunderstood the idiom. The time and manner of the death of this Father are unknown; but he was still alive in the beginning of the reign of Caracalla, A.D. 211.

There is still extant a fragment of one of the Epistles of Origen, wherein he

Narcissus was made bishop of Jerusalem about A. D. 180. The Christians of that country, in the time of Eusebius, pre-

alleges the example of *Pantænus*, in defence of the study of Greek authors, as subservient to that of Theology. Such a teacher might reasonably be expected to produce a scholar such as *Clement*, the most learned, perhaps, of all the Patristical writers, and at the same time peculiarly free from the remotest shade of self-sufficiency and arrogance. Jerome, Cyril, Theodoret, and others, bear their united testimony to his learning and research; while his own assurance, that his works were not composed “for ostentation (*εἰς ἐπίδειξιν*), but as an artless picture of the discourses of his several instructors” (*Strom.* i. 1), will be readily admitted by all who are acquainted with his works. For an “Account of his writings and opinions,” it is needless to do more than refer the reader to the luminous and judicious volume of the Bishop of Lincoln, who observes that “among the early Fathers, there is none whose writings will more amply repay the labour bestowed upon them by the classical student; on account of the numerous quotations from the Greek poets and philosophers, and the numerous allusions to the customs of heathen antiquity, which they contain.” Although Dr. Jortin had, somewhat unaccountably, omitted all notice of Clement in his remarks, he has thrown together, in an appendix, a few disjointed criticisms on some of his classical references, which are here subjoined.—
EDIT.]

Clem. Alex. Cohort. p. 74. (Ed. Ox.) :—Ἰδέτω τις ὑμῶν τοὺς παρὰ τοῖς εἰδώλοις λατρεύοντας, κόμη ῥυπῶντας, ἐσθῆτι πιναρᾷ καὶ καταρρήγυιά καθυβρισμένους, λουτρῶν μὲν παντάπασιν ἀπειράτους, ταῖς δὲ τῶν ὀνύχων ἀκμαῖς ἐκτεθηριωμένους,—οὗτοί μοι δοκοῦσι πενθεῖν, οὐ θρησκεύειν τοὺς θεούς· ἐλέου μᾶλλον ἢ θεοσεβείας ἄξια πεπονθότες. This description of the Pagan Saints suits strangely well some Christian Saints, who arose after the time of Clemens, and shows the wonderful uniformity of superstition. Tertullian, pleading the cause of the Christians, says :—*Sed infructuosi in negotiis dicimur. Quo pacto? homines vobiscum degentes, ejusdem victus, habitus, instructus, ejusdem ad vitam necessitatis. Neque enim Brachmanæ, aut Indorum Gymnosophistæ sumus, silvicolæ et exules vitæ. Meminimus gratiam debere nos Domino Deo creatori. Nullum fructum operum ejus repudiamus; plane temperamus, ne ultra modum aut perperam utamur. Itaque non sine foro, non sine macello, non sine balneis, tabernis, officinis, stabulis, nundinis vestris, ceterisque commerciis, cohabitamus hoc sæculum. Navigamus et nos vobiscum, et militamus, et rusticamur, et mercatus proinde miscemus.* (Apol. 42.) But this was before the days of Monkery.

Ib. p. 75. It becomes a wise man to seek heavenly things, κατ' ἔχνος ἐκείνης τῆς φωτεινῆς ἀεροβατοῦντα νεφέλης. He alludes to the *Ajax* of Sophocles, v. 32, κατ' ἔχνος αἰσσω.

Ib. p. 80. Στρατευόμενόν σε κατείληφεν ἡ γνῶσις; Τοῦ δίκαια σημαίνοντος ἄκουε στρατηγού. Hence it appears that Clemens thought it lawful for a Christian to serve in the army, if, when he was converted to Christianity, he was a soldier. I would translate it, *Obediens esto duci justa imperanti.*

Ib. p. 91. Let us fly from the wicked world, the dangerous island; ἄδει δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ πορνίδιον ὠραῖον, Ἡδονή, πανδήμῳ τερπόμενον μουσικῇ.

Δεῦρ' ἄγ' ἰὼν, πολύαιν' Ὀδυσσεῦ, μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν,
Νῆα κατάστησον, ἵνα θειοτέρην ὅπ' ἀκρόσῃς.

The thought is pretty, and prettily expressed. Clemens compares *Pleasure*, the fair

served the memory of some wonderful works wrought by him, and in his favour, which Eusebius relates.' It may seem the

deceitful harlot, to the *Siren* singing to Ulysses. In Homer (*Odyss.* M. 184), it is not *θειοτέρην*, but *νωϊτέρην*. We must not imagine that *θειοτέρην* could be the true reading, or a various reading in Homer; for Cicero translates it, *Auribus ut nostros possis agnoscere cantus*. Clemens altered *νωϊτέρην*, because it was not proper for his purpose. In Homer the *Sirens* speak, who were *two*: Clemens introduces *Pleasure* speaking, and therefore changes *νωϊτέρην* into *θειοτέρην*.

Ib. p. 95. Οἶαι μὲν αἱ βουλαί, τοῖοι καὶ οἱ λόγοι· ὁποῖοι δὲ οἱ λόγοι, τοῖαιδε καὶ αἱ πράξεις· καὶ ὁποῖα τὰ ἔργα, τοιοῦτος ὁ βίος. We have the same proverbial saying in Euseb. E. H. vi. 3: Οἷον γοῦν τὸν λόγον, τοῖονδε φασὶ τὸν τρόπον. *Hæc poetica sunt*, says the Editor of Clemens, *et facile in Iambicos versus transeunt*:

Οἶαι μὲν αἱ βουλαί, τοῖοιδε χ' οἱ λόγοι·
'Οποῖοι δ' οἱ λόγοι, τοῖαιδε χ' αἱ πράξεις·
Χ' ὁποῖα τὰ ἔργα, τοιοῦτος δ' ἐσθ' ὁ βίος.

But these Iambics are cripples, and would be glad to be dismissed, and to return to humble prose, as they were never intended for anything better. It would be easy to convert much of this Author's prose into verses at least as good as these. For example, p. 2, Οὐκοῦν φδῇ τῇ Εὐνόμου ἄγεται ὁ τέττιξ, ὡς ὁ μῦθος βούλεται, χαλκοῦν ἀναστήσας Πυθοῖ τὸν Εὐνομον, αὐτῇ τῇ κιθάρα, καὶ τὸν συναγωνίστην τοῦ Λοκροῦ· ὁ δὲ καὶ ἐκὼν ἐφίπταται, καὶ ἄδει ἐκὼν. This, if you will pardon a spondee or an anapest in the fourth foot, falls into passable Iambics:

οὐκοῦν φδῇ τῇ Εὐνόμου
ἄγεται ὁ τέττιξ, ὡς ὁ μῦθος βούλεται,
Χαλκοῦν ἀναστήσας Πυθοῖ τὸν Εὐνομον,
Αὐτῇ κιθάρα, καὶ τὸν συναγωνίστην Λοκροῦ·
'Ο δὲ καὶ ἐκὼν ἐφίπταται, καὶ ἄδει ἐκὼν.

Clemens had a poetical genius, had studied the poets, and is perpetually borrowing their expressions. He made some poems himself; and, in his *Cohortatio* particularly, writes in a poetical style, and gives us what one would be tempted to call *prose on horseback*, running too much into Iambic measure; as p. 83,

'Ο Χριστὸς ἐστὶ πανταχοῦ σωτήριος.

This is said without any intention to reflect upon our Editor of Clemens, or to detract in the least from his learned and useful labours. It is impossible to attend equally to everything, in so large a work; and it is no wonder, if he has left a gleanings for those who come after him.

Pædagog. i. 6. p. 127:—

Τὸ θρέψαι δ' ἐν βροτοῖσι πολλάκις
Πλείω πορίζει φίλτρα τοῦ φῦσαι τέκνα.

The first verse wants the first foot. Write,

—— τὸ θρέψαι δ' ἐν βροτοῖσι πολλάκις.

Ib. ii. 2. p. 181:—

Φιλεῖ τε πολλὴν γλῶτταν ἐκχέας μάτην
Ἄκων ἀκούειν ἄπερ ἐκὼν εἶπεν κακῶς.

⁷ Euseb. H. E. vi. 9, 10, 11.

more probable that he should have been enabled to perform miracles, because he is not only represented as a very good man,

From this poet perhaps Terence borrowed,

Si mihi pergit, quæ volt, dicere ; ea, quæ non volt, audiet.

Ib. ii. 2. p. 186 :—Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ αἶμα, αἶμα τῆς ἀμπέλου, κ. τ. λ. This passage shows that Clemens knew nothing of *Transubstantiation*. See the Editor. But there is a passage still stronger in Augustin against this unintelligible doctrine. *Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui.* “For our Lord scrupled not to say, This is my body, when he gave the sign of his body.” (*Contr. Adim. c. 12.*) *Haud pauca sunt vocabula, quæ, non dicam obscuram, sed nullam plane potestatem subjectam habent ; non secus quam Aristophanicum φλαττοθραττο-φλαττοθρατ.—Hoc observare est potissimum in vocabulis quibusdam, quæ grandia occultare dicuntur mysteria ; qualia sunt vocabula Transubstantiationis, Præsentiae corporis non naturalis sed sacramentalis, Ubiquitatis humanæ naturæ Christi, &c. Quæ adferimus, non quasi sola, sed ut eximia quædam exempla vocabulorum nihil significantium.* (Clericus *Art. Critic.*)

Ib. ii. 8. p. 211 :—τὸ δὲ πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκηράτου λειμῶνος κοσμήσαντας οἴκοι περιφέρειν, οὐ σωφρόνων. *Hæc poetica sunt*, says the Editor. Poetical they are, to be sure, for they are taken from these elegant lines of Euripides (*Hipp. 72*) :—

Σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκηράτου
Λειμῶνος, ᾧ δέσποινα, κυσμήσας φέρω,
Ἐνθ' οὔτε ποιμὴν ἀξιοῖ φέρβειν βοτὰ,
Οὐδ' ἤλθέ πω σίδηρος, ἀλλ' ἀκήρατον
Μέλισσα λειμῶν' ἡρινὸν διέρχεται.

Here ἀξιοῖ is ill translated *vult*. The meaning is, *Where the shepherd presumes not to feed his flocks*. Instead of ἡρινὸν, in the last verse, I should like ἡρινός. Μέλισσα ἡρινός, the vernal bee. [See Monk *ad loc.* EDIT.]

Ib. p. 211 :—ἄμφω γὰρ μαραίνειτον (μαραίνεσθον), καὶ τὸ ἄνθος, καὶ τὸ κάλλος. See the same thought in an Epigram of the *Anthologia* (L. vii. p. 616. *Ed. Brod.*) :—
Πέμπω σοὶ κ. τ. λ.

Ib. p. 213 :—Οὐ γὰρ μετέχεις ῥόδων τῶν ἐκ Πιερίας. Taken from Sappho. The fragment, which makes us regret the loss of the poem, is thus :—

Κατθανοῖσα δὲ κείσεαι,
Οὐδέ ποτε μναμοσύνα σέθεν
Ἔσσεται, οὐδέ ποκ' ὕστερον
Οὐ γὰρ μετέχεις ῥόδων
Τῶν ἐκ Πιερίας· ἀλλ' ἀφανῆς
Ἐκὼν Ἀῖδα δόμοις φοιτάσεις.

Whence Horace might borrow *Carm. iv. 9* :—

*sed omnes illacrimabiles
Urgentur ignotique longa
Nocte, carent quia vate sacro.*

Ib. ii. 10. p. 235 :—Τί γὰρ φρονιμὸν κ. τ. λ. These verses are set right, at p. 254.

Ib. iii. 2, p. 257 :—Τράπεζα πλήρης, καὶ κύλικες ἐπάλληλοι. *Versus Iambicus*. I take it to be prose. If it be a verse, it is a *Scæzon*.

but he was, in some manner, a disciple or successor of the Apostles, and an Apostolical Father : for he was born about A. D.

Ib. p. 259:—'Ενυβρίζει τῷ ναυστάθμῳ ὁ βάρβαρος ἀδικία κρατεῖ, καὶ τοῦ ποιητοῦ Διὸς
'κείνου τὸ ὕμα τοὺς Θρᾷκας βλέπει. He speaks of the Trojan war :—ἀδικία κρατεῖ,
that is, *The perjured Trojans prevail, and Jupiter casts his eyes upon the Thracians* ;
from Hom. Il. N. 1.

Ζεὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν Τρῳάς τε καὶ Ἑκτορα νηυσὶ πέλασσε,
Τοὺς μὲν ἔα παρὰ τῇσι πόνον τ' ἐχέμεν καὶ οἷζύν
Νωλεμέως· αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν τρέπεν ὅσσε φαεινῶ,
Νόσφιν ἐφ' ἵπποπόλων Θρηκῶν καθορώμενος αἶαν.

Heinsius for ποιητοῦ reads ποιητικοῦ, and indeed Clemens uses that expression, which somewhat favours the emendation. *Strom.* ii. 493, ἤδη γοῦν καὶ τοῦ ποιητικοῦ Διὸς τὴν αἰγίδα γράφουσι.

Ib. Εὐγενὲς αἷμα βάρβαρα πίνει πέδια. *Ingenuus sanguis barbaros potat campos.* *The blood drinks the fields*, says the translator. One would rather think that the fields drink the blood. *Ingenuum sanguinem barbari bibunt campi.*

Ib. p. 294:—Τὸ δ' ὅλον οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι ἐγὼ ψιθυρίζειν οὐδὲ κατακεκλασμένος, πλάγιον ποιήσας τὸν τράχηλον, περιπατεῖν ὥσπερ ἑτέρους ὁρῶ κιναίδους ἐνθάδε πολλοὺς ἐν ἄστει, καὶ πεπιττοκοπημένους. *Cujusdam Comici verba*, says the Editor. True ; and therefore they should be written thus :

τόδ' ὅλον, οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι
'Εγὼ ψιθυρίζειν, οὐδὲ κατακεκλασμένος,
Πλάγιον ποιήσας τὸν τράχηλον, περιπατεῖν,
Ὡσπερ ἑτέρους ὁρῶ κιναίδους ἐνθάδε
Πολλοὺς ἐν ἄστει, καὶ πεπιττοκοπημένους.

Ib. p. 296:—Ὁ κωμικὸς Φιλήμων φησὶν, Ἐξὸν γυναικὸς κ. τ. λ. *Certissima emendatione*, says Bentley, *sic locum repono* :

Ἐξὸν γυναικὸς ἐξόπισθ' ἐλευθέρας
Βλέπειν θεράπαιναν κατόπιν ἀκολουθεῖν καλὴν,
'Εκ τοῦ Πλαταιικοῦ, παρακολουθοῦντά τε τινὰ
Ταύτῃ κατιλλώπτειν.

But, since the third verse is very clumsy, perhaps it should be,

Ἐκ τοῦ Πλαταιικοῦ, παρακολουθοῦντί τε
Ταύτῃ κατιλλώπτειν.

See Bentley on Menander and Philemon, p. 133.

Ib. p. 312. Clemens concludes his book with an hymn to Christ :—Στόμιον πάλαι
ἀδαῶν, κ. τ. λ. *Videtur mihi*, says Bull, *hic hymnus desumptus ex Canticis sacris in primæva Ecclesia usurpatis, vel certe ad eorundem imitationem compositus.* (Def. Fid. Nic. p. 189.) But it is undoubtedly the composition of Clemens : the style shows it, and the expressions, which he had used in the *Pædagogus*. Clemens was perhaps the first Christian who was capable of making such poems as this, and that which follows it.

Ib. p. 313:—Σοὶ τόνδε κἀγὼ, Παιδαγωγέ, προσφέρω
Λόγοισι πλέξας στέφανον, ἐξ ἀκηράτου
Λειμῶνος.

96, before the death of St. John, was made bishop when he was eighty-four years old, and lived to an uncommon age; to a

This is an imitation of the verses of Euripides which are cited above (p. 281).

Ib. Ὡς ἐργάτις μέλιττα χωρίων ἄπο
Βλάστην τρυγῶσα, χρηστὸν ἐκ σίμβλων πόνον
Κηρὸν δίδωσι τὸν γλυκὺν τῷ προστάτῃ·
Εἰ καὶ βραχὺς δ' ἐγώ τις, οἰκέτης γε σός.

So Horace *Carm.* iv. ii. 27, *Ego apis Matinæ more modoque*, &c. There is the same thought in Plato's *Ion*; and thence perhaps Clemens took it.

Strom. i. p. 238:—Στρεπτή γὰρ γλῶσσα βροτῶν πολέες δ' ἐνι μῦθοι. Here is a καὶ dropped:—στρεπτή γὰρ καὶ γλῶσσα βροτῶν. But in Homer (*Il.* γ. 248), it is, Στρεπτή δὲ γλῶσσ' ἐστὶ βροτῶν.

Ib. p. 360:—Ὁ τὴν Τιτανομαχίαν γράψας. The anonymous writer of the *Giants' Wars*, cited here by Clemens, says that Chiron

Εἷς τε δικαιοσύνην θνητῶν γένος ἤγαγε, δείξας
Ὅρκον, καὶ θυσίας ἱλαρὰς, καὶ σχήματ' Ὀλύμπου.

According to some, Ὀλύμπου σχήματα are the *Celestial gods*: as Sir Isaac Newton thinks, they are the *Asterisms* which Chiron delineated. Mr. Wasse conjectured that it should be σήματ' Ὀλύμπου, the *signs of heaven*. Chiron brought the world to a sense of religion by teaching the obligation of an oath, the manner of sacrificing, and the signs of the divine will; or the threats and admonitions, the portents and prognostics of heaven. See the *Misc. Observat.* ii. p. 233. To the passages collected by Mr. Wasse may be added these lines of Parmenides, as they stand in Clemens (*Strom.* v. p. 732):—

Εἶση δ' αἰθερίαν τε φύσιν, τὰ τ' ἐν αἰθέρι πάντα
ΣΗΜΑΤΑ, καὶ καθαρᾶς εὐαγέος ἡελίοιο
Λαμπάδος ἔργ' αἰδηλα, καὶ ὀππόθεν ἐξεγένοντο·
Ἔργα τε κύκλωπος πεύση περίφοιτα σελήνης
Καὶ φύσιν.

Ib. p. 399:—Πολυῖδός τε ἐν Ἀργεὶ καὶ ἐν Μεγάροις, οὗ μέμνηται ἡ τραγωδία. Homer also mentions him (*Il.* N. 663.)

Strom. ii. p. 463. Some writer says in a Comedy,

Παιδισκάριον με, φησὶν, εὐτελὲς καταδεδούλωκεν.

This may be thus restored to its measure:—

Παιδισκάριον με καταδεδούλωκ' εὐτελές.

Strom. iii. p. 508. It appears here that the Basilidians used the Gospel of St. Matthew, and St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians; but wrested and misrepresented them.

Ib. p. 517:—πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶ συμφορῇ. *Quivis homo nihil est aliud quam calamitas*. This translation gives us not the sense of the Greek. They are the words of Solon in Herodotus (i. 42.); where the MSS. and the edition of Gronovius have, πᾶν ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος συμφορῇ. And the meaning is, *Man is altogether what chance makes him, happy or unhappy*. See Kuster in Le Clerc *Bibl. A. et M.* v. p. 390. Gronovius understood it not.

Strom. iv. p. 574:—Κακὸν οὖν ἦν τὸ παίδευμ' εἰς εὐανδρίαν
Ὁ πλοῦτος ἀνθρώποισιν, αἱ τ' ἄγαν τρυφαί.

hundred and sixteen at least.⁸ But as his miracles stand upon *traditional report* in Eusebius, every one may judge of them as he thinks fit.

From Euripides : but the first line is not a verse. Perhaps,—

Κακὸν μὲν οὖν τὸ παίδευμ' εἰς εὐανδρίαν—

Or

Κακὸν τὸ παίδευμ' ἐστὶν εἰς εὐανδρίαν.

Ib. p. 600. Basilides says, ὁ μοιχεῦσαι θέλων, μοιχὸς ἐστὶ, κἂν τοῦ μοιχεῦσαι μὴ ἐπιτεύχῃ. He alludes most manifestly to *Matt.* v. 28. Read, μὴ ἐπιτύχῃ.

Ib. p. 635.

—ἀεὶ τὸ βούλημα τοῦ θεοῦ σκοπῶν, τῷ ὄντι,
Οἷος πεπνυμένος, τοὶ δ' ὥς σκιά ἀΐσσουσιν.

Every one has seen that this is taken from Homer, and accommodated to the sentence with a small alteration : but it should not stand thus, like a verse, with a false quantity in it. It should be—ἀεὶ τὸ βούλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ σκοπῶν, τῷ ὄντι, οἷος πεπνυμένος τοὶ δ' ὥς σκιά ἀΐσσουσιν. Homer (*Odys.* K. 494.) says of Tiresias :—

Τῷ καὶ τεθνείωτι νόον πόρε Περσεφόνηια,
Οἷφ πεπνύσθαι· τοὶ δὲ σκιά ἀΐσσουσιν.

Strom. v. p. 732, Κατὰ τὸν Εὐριπίδην, ὅς, τάδε λεύσσων, θεὸν οὐχὶ νοεῖ, μετεωρολόγων δ' ἐκὰς ἔρριψεν σκολιάς ἀπάτας, ὧν ἀτειρὰ γλῶσσα εἰκοβολεῖ περὶ τῶν ἀφανῶν, οὐδὲν γνώμης μετέχουσα. The Latin version is somewhat incomprehensible, and *jargonie*. Let us pass it by, and consider the Greek, which may be thus put in better order, with very small alterations ; Κατὰ τὸν Εὐριπίδην,

Ὅς τάδε λεύσσων, θεὸν οὐχὶ νοεῖ,
Μετεωρολόγων ἐκὰς ἔρριψεν
Σκολιάς ἀπάτας, ὧν περ ἀτειρῆς
Γλῶσσ' εἰκοβολεῖ περὶ τῶν ἀφανῶν,
Οὐδὲν γνώμης μετέχουσα.

The meaning of the fragment is perhaps this ;

Qui hæc videns, Deum (auctorem) non sentit,
Is Sophistarum temere effutit
Perversos errores, quorum garrula
Lingua male judicat de rebus non visibilibus,
Omni sapientia destituta.

In the third line you may read ὠνάτην, which is the editor's conjecture.

Ib. p. 817:—ὡς γάρ που τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φῶς δι' ὑελοῦ σκεύους πλήρους ὕδατος μεθοδεύει ἡ τέχνη εἰς πῦρ. This was the burning glass of the ancients. See *Plin.* N. H. xxxvii. 2. *Aristoph. Nub.* 764.

Strom. vii. p. 841,—

—σκῦλα μὲν βροτοφθόρα
Χαίρεις ὀρώσ' ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἐρείπια.

The second line is no verse. Perhaps,—

Χαίρεις ὀρώσα, καὶ νεκρῶν ἐρείπια.

This also makes better sense. *Tibi voluptati est videre spolia sanguinea, et caesorum cadavera.*

⁸ It should seem that *Narcissus*, in consequence of his extraordinary age, was incapable of taking any active part in the administration of his see during the latter

Narcissus is said to have turned water into oil; but the change of water into oil, to supply the church-lamps, has the air of a miracle performed upon an occasion rather too slender. Let us therefore leave it *in ambiguo*. This miracle, however, calls to mind a story related by Dio,⁹ Orosius,¹ and Eusebius,² that, in the time of Augustus, a fountain of oil burst out at Rome, and flowed for a whole day. In Natural History there are accounts of greasy and bituminous springs, where something like oil has floated on the water. Pliny³ and Hardouin, in his notes, mention many such fountains, *qui explent olei vicem*, and *quorum aqua lucernæ ardeant*. So that this report of Dio and the rest, should not rashly be ranked with *the appearance of Castor and Pollux, the man with the red beard*, and other prodigies of the like nature.

An anonymous writer⁴ of the second century says, that *Natalis*, a confessor, having accepted of a bishoprick amongst the heretics, was severely scourged all night by angels, and the next morning repented and returned to the church. The testimony of this unknown writer cannot be of great authority: but the story seems to have given the hint to Jerome to feign that he also underwent the same discipline for studying profane authors, Cicero, Virgil, &c.⁵ Upon this one of the Italian *Ciceronians* has observed, that if Jerome was whipped for being a *Ciceronian*; that is, for writing altogether in the style and manner of Cicero; he suffered what he did not deserve, and might have pleaded *Not guilty*.⁶

years of his life. Accordingly, *Alexander*, Bishop of Cappadocia, was translated to the joint-government of the Church at Jerusalem; and this prelate speaks thus of the co-episcopate, in a letter to the Christians of Antinopolis in Egypt (Jerom. de Vir. Ill. c. 62):—*Salutat vos Narcissus, qui ante me hic tenuit episcopalem locum, et nunc mecum eundem orationibus regit, annos natus circiter centum sedecim; et vos mecum precatur, ut unum idemque sapiatis*. The time of the aged bishop's death is unknown.—EDIT. ⁹ xlviii. ¹ vi. ² In his *Chronicon*.

³ N. H. xxxi. p. 549.

⁴ *Apud* Euseb. E. H. v. 28.

⁵ *Cicero* and *Plautus* are more particularly specified. The account is given in a letter to Eustochius (Epist. 22), with a view to deter him from the study of profane literature; nor does he hesitate to appeal to heaven in proof of the truth of his statement. It was made, at all events, during the access of a raging fever, which may in some degree account for the illusion of which he was evidently the victim.—EDIT.

⁶ Yet he was a very good writer, for the time in which he lived. [He died in the year 420. Some further notice will be taken of him in due order of time.—EDIT.]

Of all the Latin Fathers, *Lactantius* would have been entitled to the most stripes, as being by far the purest and politest writer; but he escaped this punishment: he was not *whipped*; he was only *starved*. *Lactantius, vir omnium suo tempore eruditissimus, sed adeo pauper, ut plerumque etiam necessariis indiguerit.*⁷ I mention not this as anything extraordinary or wonderful, nor as one of the miracles of the fourth century: for *poverty* is a disease which rages as much, and as frequently, in the *Republic of Letters*, as the *plague* in *Constantinople*. The motto of the republic was given to it by Terence:—*Modo liceat vivere; est spes. Quæ? Nos esurituros satis.*

From the death of Severus (A.D. 211), to Decius (A.D. 249), the Christians enjoyed a calm with little interruption: but prosperity is often a greater trial than adversity; and a relaxation of discipline and a corruption of manners ensued. Cyprian⁸ complains of it heavily, and describes it in very strong terms, which yet may perhaps require some abatement; though other writers concur in a great measure with him. His vehement temper, his indignation against vice, and his African eloquence, might induce him to make free with a figure called *Exaggeration*. But the number of Christians, who fell from the faith in the Decian persecution, shows that there had been a preceding degeneracy. As the Christians and the Pagans had dwelt quietly together in civil society, they learned something of each other; and the former grew too compliant to worldly fashions, and suffered from the contagion of bad example. In the time of Tertullian, if not before, there were some Christian soldiers;⁹ and it is hard

⁷ Hieron. in *Chron.* [The poverty of Lactantius was, in some degree, voluntary. Jortin does not speak of him at large; and here, therefore, it may be related, that he flourished in the early part of the fourth century; that he was a disciple of *Arnobius*, and the tutor of Crispus, the son of Constantine; and that he died about A.D. 325. His great work, the "*Divine Institutions*," is an elegant and able confutation of Heathenism, written in a style which will bear comparison with that of Cicero. It may probably have had some share in the conversion of Constantine; though Jerome (Epist. 13) speaks of the writer as more successful in combating the doctrines of others than in maintaining his own. Whether he was the author of a work, entitled "*The Death of the Persecutors*," which is commonly attributed to him—being a vindication of the retributive justice of God in the punishment of the enemies of the Gospel even in this world—may fairly be questioned. More probably it was the production of some unknown contemporary. It may have suggested the remarks of Jortin on the same subject, which will be found under the reign of Constantine.—
EDIT.]

⁸ De Lapsis.

⁹ Apol. c. 5.

to conceive how they could maintain their innocence in that station, and avoid such dissimulation, and such practices as were scarcely allowable. ¹ It is to be supposed that the Christians kept out of the army as much as they could; which they might the more easily do, because the Roman Service was attended with many profits, advantages, and privileges. Thus the army was supplied and recruited with the less difficulty; and the officers were usually cautious in accepting those who offered themselves, and required testimonials of their being duly and legally qualified: but to be sure it must have happened sometimes that Christians were not left to their option; that a refusal would have been criminal; and that they must have listed, or have offended against the civil laws. In such cases they might think it permitted to them to enter into the service, though hardly as volunteers; but in this point, from the time of Tertullian, they grew less and less scrupulous.

Eusebius highly commends the behaviour of the Christian soldiers, who, in the reign of Diocletian, suffered themselves to be turned out, rather than renounce their religion; and at the same time represents their station as very honourable and very profitable, and producing τιμὴν, δόξαν, εὐπραγίαν.² Martin was ordered by his father, who had served in the army, to list himself (as the laws required) about A.D. 356: *cum edictum esset a regibus, ut veteranorum filii ad militiam scriberentur.*³ The army was chiefly composed of citizens, who had some fortunes, more or less; and whose names were in the public registers: nor did the Romans usually admit aliens, or beggars, or bankrupts, or slaves, or freed-men into the land service, though in choosing marines they were not nice and scrupulous. They who refused to serve, when they were summoned, unless they had an exemption or a lawful excuse, were severely punished. But the stipends, the rewards, the privileges, the promotions, and the military genius of the Romans, made it easy enough to find soldiers.⁴

Towards the middle of the third century, one Paul fled from

¹ *Tertul.* Apol. c. 16. Religio tota castrensis Signa veneratur, Signa jurat, Signa omnibus Diis præponit. Afterwards the Christian soldiers worshipped their *Labarum*.

² *Euseb.* E. H. viii. 4.

³ *Sulpit. Sever. Vit. Mart.* c. 2.

⁴ See *Lipsius de Milit. Rom.*, and particularly the *Theod. Code*, l. vii. p. 251, &c.

the persecution, for which he deserves to be commended: and, quitting all that he had, he retired to the deserts; and, contracting a love of solitude and a dislike of the world, lived there alone, as it is said, ninety years. This hermit unfortunately set an example, which was followed by too many; and he may be considered as a kind of father, and founder of the Monks. Jerome wrote his life; his romance, I should say; as also that of *Hilarion*, who became a monk in the beginning of the fourth century, when Antony was propagating Monkery in Egypt, and gathering disciples.⁵

About the same time began the schism of the *Novatians*; which lasted two hundred years, and then dwindled away. Their distinguishing character was that they would not receive into the church penitent sinners, and those who *lapsed* in time of persecution. They are also said to have condemned *second marriages*. There were, at the end of the sixth century, some people in Alexandria called *Novatians*, who refused to honour the relics of the martyrs; and, therefore, were accused of despising the saints, and of making a jest of martyrdom, according to the stupid jargon of the times.⁶

XXI. OF ORIGEN.

ORIGEN was born A. D. 185, and died about 253. He was very learned and ingenious, and indefatigably industrious. His whole life from his early years was spent in examining, teaching, and explaining the Scriptures, to which he joined the study of philosophy, and of all polite literature. He was humble, modest, and patient under great injuries and cruel treatment, which he received from Christians and Pagans; for, though he ever had a considerable number of friends and admirers on account of his amiable qualities and useful accomplishments, he was persecuted and calumniated by men who had neither his learning, nor his virtue. He was degraded from the order of Presbyters, driven from his home, and excommunicated by one

⁵ Tillemont hath made two extraordinary concessions concerning Jerome, that he was more disposed to augment than to diminish miracles, and that exactness was no part of his character. (*H. E.* vii. p. 669, *not.*) And Du Pin observes that Jerome's *Life of Paul* contains things, *qui sont fort peu croyables*.

⁶ Tillemont, *H. E.* iii. p. 475.

Demetrius, Bishop of Alexandria, who envied him, says Eusebius, for the reputation which he had gained.⁷ Whilst they were both together in the land of the living, the Bishop had the advantage over the presbyter, so as to be able to harass and oppress him: but now *Origen* is a far more illustrious and a far more reverend name than *Demetrius*, in the Christian world, and in the republic of letters. *Suum cuique decus rependit posteritas.*

Pro hoc sudore quid accepit præmii Origines? Damnatur a Demetrio Episcopo. Exceptis Palæstinæ et Arabiæ et Phœnices atque Achaïæ sacerdotibus, in damnationem ejus consentit orbis. Roma ipsa contra hunc cogit senatum; non propter dogmatum novitatem, nec propter hæresim, ut nunc adversus eum rabidi canes simulant: sed quia gloriam eloquentiæ ejus et scientiæ ferre non poterant, et, illo docente, omnes muti putabantur. So said Jerome, whilst he had a favourable opinion of Origen, and before he turned his coat, and abused him.⁸ *There are many, says Origen,⁹ who, loving me more than I deserve, speak too advantageously of me, and ascribe to me what I have not, and pretend not to have. Others decry all that I say and do, and accuse me of sentiments which I never held. Both transgress the rules of truth; the latter through spite and hatred, the former through fond affection:—affection which perhaps deludes and misleads as much as enmity.*

By boldly and openly confessing Jesus Christ at all times, by attending the martyrs, and by converting many, and some of them considerable persons, to Christianity, he highly provoked the Pagans, and was often in the utmost danger; and in the reign of Decius he underwent imprisonment, chains, and tortures. When he was not seventeen years old, his father suffered martyrdom; and he had so earnest a desire to die with him for the same cause, and threw himself so much in the way of the persecutors, that his mother was obliged to use violence and to confine him at home. He then wrote his father a letter, exhorting him to be constant, and not moved by compassion and affection for his family, which consisted of a wife and seven sons who had nothing to support them, and would be left in great

⁷ Demetrius had been the early patron of Origen, and therefore Mosheim supposes that he would scarcely have been jealous of him afterwards.—EDIT.

⁸ Vid. Rufin. Apol. ii.

⁹ In Luc. Hom. 25.

want. He was ever extremely sober and exemplary, practising what he preached to others; and he lived and died poor, and destitute even of common conveniences. He carried his rigour and self-denial to an excess, using austerities which proved prejudicial to his constitution; and, whilst he expounded the Scriptures too much in the *allegorical* way,¹ he interpreted, I know not how, some passages too *literally*; and, by acting suitably to such a sense, he injured his own body and his health:—but this was in his younger days, and he condemned himself for it afterwards.

His inquisitive genius, and his mixing philosophy with Christianity, led him, perhaps, into some learned singularities, and ingenious *rêveries*; but he was by temper far from dogmatising in such points, from fomenting schisms, and setting up himself for the head of a party. He lived in times when Christians were not so shackled with systems and determinations as they were afterwards, nor so much exposed to disingenuous and illiberal objections; and had more liberty to pursue their inquiries, and to speak their mind.

That he sacrificed to idols, to avoid an obscene and most infamous punishment contrived by the Pagans, is a tale recorded by the father of tales;—by Epiphanius, who was a diligent collector of groundless and censorious reports,² and who hated Origen and his writings. Towards the end of his life he wrote his justly-esteemed book against Celsus; where, after owning that the number of miracles in his days was very much diminished, he speaks of some which were performed even then, as, healing the sick, and casting out devils by invocation of Jesus; and he mentions some who were converted to Christianity by visions and revelations. He speaks of some of these things as one who was well informed, and he appeals to God that what he says is true.³ This seems to be the best testimony we have that the sick in those days were sometimes miraculously healed; and thus much may be affirmed, that he was utterly incapable of affirming a fact which he knew or suspected to be false.

¹ His excesses of this kind can never be excused: they were in him even a distemper, which might be called *Furor Allegoricus*.

² See above, p. 241.

³ Orig. c. Cels. pp. 34, 35, &c.

But from his writings, and from his conduct, it appears too evidently to be denied or dissembled, that, with all his great and good qualities, he had a warm imagination; which lessens the force of his testimony in the affair of miracles, though his piety and probity be unquestionable. He seems to have admitted the power⁴ of magical spells, and the efficacy of divine names pronounced in barbarous languages; and hence he also was accused of approving magic arts, by some of his adversaries; but unreasonably, since they ought rather to have charged him with overcredulity in these things.

Beausobre⁵ observes, that "Origen figured to himself divers kinds of dæmons, presiding, if we may so say, over different vices, and having each their prince and their chief. Legions of dæmons, some of pride, others of anger, others of avarice or fornication, laboured incessantly, under the orders of their leaders, to seduce miserable mortals, and to turn their hearts towards vice. This imagination was not peculiar to Origen." It is no wonder if they, who supposed that each vice had its presiding and influencing dæmon, found dæmons and dæmoniacs everywhere, and ascribed almost every moral or natural evil to evil spirits; so that a profligate fellow could not commit any misdemeanor, but it was, *Siquis, instigante diabolo, &c.* But what Origen has delivered concerning *divine impulses* upon hearts properly disposed to receive them, is more probable and more reasonable. *Many people, says he, have been brought over to Christianity by the Spirit of God giving a sudden turn to their minds, and offering visions to them either by day or by night; so that, instead of hating the Word, they became ready even to lay down their lives for it. I have seen many examples of this sort. — God is my witness, that my sole purpose is, to recommend the religion of Jesus, not by fictitious tales, &c.* Why should it be thought improbable that Pagans, of good dispositions, but not free from prejudices, should have been called by divine admonitions, by dreams, or visions, which might be a support and a reinforcement to Christianity in those days of

⁴ Contra Cels. i. 19. Synesius, a Platonic philosopher and a bishop, had much the same notions.

⁵ Hist. de Man. ii. 20. See Orig. in Jos. Hom. xv. App. Mass. Diss. in Iren. p. 62.

distress? Basilides, whilst he was a Pagan soldier, had showed great humanity and compassion to *Potamiæna*, an illustrious virgin and martyr, and she prayed to God for his conversion; and, as we are told, appeared to him in a dream; upon which he professed himself a Christian, and was beheaded.⁶ *Potamiæna* seems to have been one of Origen's disciples,⁷ and it is not at all unlikely, though I think it has hitherto escaped observation, that Origen had this example in his thoughts when he wrote the words above cited.

Socrates, the historian, makes a remark, in which Plato and Origen are concerned. Speaking of two learned Presbyters, he expresses his wonder that they continued Arians, *since one of them was very fond of Plato, and the other of Origen*; ὦν ὁ μὲν τὸν Πλάτωνα ἀεὶ μετὰ χεῖρας εἶχεν· ὁ δὲ Ὁριγένην ἀνέπνεεν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ Πλάτων, says he, τὸ δεύτερον καὶ τὸ τρίτον αἷτιον, ὥς αὐτὸς ὀνομάζειν εἴωθεν, ἀρχὴν ὑπάρξεως εἰληφέναι φησί· καὶ Ὁριγένης συναῖδιον πανταχοῦ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τῷ Πατρί.⁸ He adds that these two eloquent and learned Ecclesiastics, though they continued in their own Church, mended and improved the Arians not a little, and brought them nearer to the Consubstantialists. Both sides wanted mending very much, and to be taught to differ and dispute at least like Christians, and not to pull out one another's eyes.

The Arians and the Consubstantialists⁹ both laid claim to Origen, as favouring their systems, and neither side wanted arguments drawn from his writings: for, on the one hand, Origen admitted the eternity of the Λόγος, and, on the other hand, he said many things concerning the Λόγος, which seemed agreeable to the Semi-Arian doctrines. He was a Platonic Christian, and a Platonist would have readily allowed that the Λόγος was an *eternal* emanation, or production, from the *First Cause*, the Τὸ Ἔν.

Cudworth has made it probable that some notion of a Trinity

⁶ See the story of Basilides and Potamiæna, in Euseb. H. E. vi. 5.

⁷ Rufinus Potamiænam Origenis discipulam facit. In quo Rufino refragari equidem non ausim. Etsi enim id diserte non dixit Eusebius, ex ejus tamen narratione id colligi videtur. Nam cum Martyres, qui ex Origenis schola extiterunt, hic recensens, Basilidem et Potamiænam illis accenseat, hi quoque ex Origenis discipulis fuerint necesse est: quod cum de Basilide dici non possit, de Potamiæna certe fit admodum probabile.—Valesius.

⁸ Socrat. H. E. vii. 6.

⁹ One part of them, I mean; for others condemned him as a father of Arianism.

obtained in the Pagan world. It is to be found even amongst the Chinese, if the accounts given us of that nation may be credited. Whence had the Pagans this notion? From the *first chapter of Genesis*, say some persons. Let them by all means enjoy their opinion, if they can refrain from anathematising those who differ from them, and not imitate the sage Council of Sirmium,¹ which anathematised all those who should dare to deny that God the Father spake to his Son, when he said, *Let us make man*, etc.²

The Platonic philosophers, when they considered the visible, and vital, and intellectual system, found that, besides sluggish and inanimate matter, which has a shadowy being, and is a small remove above nothing, there existed in the universe, *life* and *active power*; above that, *reason, understanding, wisdom*; above that, *goodness*; above which there could be no imaginable perfection. The same things they found in every man who acts according to nature, namely, *life, reason, and goodness*. Tracing effects up to their causes, and proceeding in the ascending scale, above all other beings they placed as *Principles*, a $\Psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, above that a $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, and above both a $\tau\acute{o} \delta' \epsilon\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \text{'}\Lambda\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\nu$. These notions the Platonics ascribed to their master; but it must be confessed that Plato talks *very obscurely* upon the subject.

The Emperor Julian, who rejected Christ, did not reject the notion of a $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. His $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ was *the Sun*, whom he accounted to be the visible image of the invisible God, whilst he perversely shut his eyes against the *Sun of righteousness* that arose on a benighted world with salvation in his rays.

Erasmus was one of those who had a high esteem for Origen. *Plus me docet*, says he, *Christianæ philosophiæ unica Origenis pagina, quam decem Augustini*. This is an honourable testimony for Origen: it is *Laudari a viro laudato*.³

XXII. OF GREGORY THAUMATURGUS.

GREGORY, called *Thaumaturgus*, a disciple of Origen, is said

¹ Socrates, H. E. ii. 30.

² Gen. i. 26. That this opinion, however, is very generally received will be seen from the commentators. Of the Platonic Trinity, see Dean Ireland's *Paganism and Christianity Compared*, chap. 6; and Burton's *Bampton Lectures*, Notes 22, 90.—EDIT.

³ For a good account of the Life and Writings of Origen, see Tillemont (Eccl. Mem. T. iii. pp. 494, &c.).—EDIT.

to have wrought many miracles ; but Eusebius, who makes honourable mention of him, says not a word concerning them, which is remarkable. Some of them are of a very suspicious kind ; as, his writing laconic epistles to Satan, and laying commands upon him, which were punctually obeyed. This is full as probable as that the bones of Babylas drove the devil from Daphne ; though both these ingenious stories, with others of the same kind, are defended by Tillemont, and by Father Baltus ; and the latter by Cave, and by many other writers. The relators of Gregory's miracles, lived when romancing was much in fashion ; as, Socrates, Theodoret, Rufinus ; and also Gregory of Nyssa who wrote his life ; and this Gregory's brother Basil, who had learned many of these stories from their grandmother, Macrina. Gregory Nyssen says also that the Apostle St. John, at the request of the Virgin Mary, presented Thaumaturgus with a *Creed*, which the Saint wrote down immediately, and ever after made use of, as well he might, and transmitted it to posterity. The story seems to have been borrowed from the transactions between *Numa* and the *Goddess Egeria* ; and both are equally credible. This *διοπετὲς ἄγαλμα*, *this symbol dropt from the clouds*, which must needs be a wonderful curiosity, is still extant, to our great benefit ; and may be seen, though it cannot be warranted free from interpolations, in Fabricius,⁴ or in Cave's *Life of Gregory*. Here arises no small difficulty, the solution of which shall be left to those whom it concerns. If the Christians of the fourth and following centuries were satisfied with the truth of this narration, they should certainly have drawn up no new *Creeds* ; but have rested contented with a truly *Apostolical Symbol*, and not have had the vanity to think that they could compose a better than St. John's.

Many of these⁵ celestial gifts were bestowed in better days upon mortal men. Pachomius, a monk of the fourth century, received from an Angel a table of brass, containing rules for the Monastic Order. The fact is related by Cyril of Alexandria, by Palladius,⁷ by Sozomen,⁸ and by Gennadius.⁹ *Be it as it*

⁴ See Waterland's *Importance*, &c., p. 232. Berriman's *Hist. Acc. of the Trin. Contr.* pp. 138, 141. Middleton's *Inquiry*, p. 148.

⁵ *Bibl. Græc.* v. p. 249.

⁶ See more of these Christian frauds in Beausobre (*Hist. de Manich.* i. p. 338).

⁷ *Lausiaca*, c. 38.

⁸ *E. H.* iii. 14.

⁹ *Vit. Patr.*

will, says Du Pin, *although this story be reported by many Authors, I cannot think that we are absolutely obliged to believe it.*¹

In the eighth century, some monks pretended that the angel Gabriel had brought *twelve* articles from Heaven; one of which was that ecclesiastics must not marry.² A *thirteenth* should have been added, *that they might keep concubines.* In the twelfth century, an angel brought from Heaven a book of prophecies upon copper plates, and gave it to a priest called Cyril, who gave it to Abbot Joachim.³ In Fabricius⁴ there is an Epistle of Jesus Christ which was said to have fallen from Heaven. But this is an imposture too profane to be laughed at. Not only the ancient Pagan legislators, but the heretics also had the start of the Catholics in this curious device. An obscure sect of men, called *Helcesaitæ*, βίβλον τινὰ φέρουσιν, ἣν λεγουσιν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταπεπτωκέναι, *produce a book, which they affirm to have fallen from Heaven.*⁵

It is affirmed, and there is no reason to reject it, that when Gregory was made bishop, Neocæsarea and its neighbourhood consisted almost entirely of Pagans;⁶ and that, when he died, he left it as full of Christians, whom he had converted, and who retained a great and lasting respect for his memory; which was honoured, says Socrates, in Athens, Berytus, Pontus, and indeed in all the earth.

XXIII. OF THE MANICHÆAN HERESY.

In the third century began the Manichæan heresy, of which I shall give an account extracted from *Beausobre*, who has fully discussed the subject in his *History of Manichæism*, and cleared it from abundance of lies and forgeries.

The Manichæans fell into great errors, and strangely corrupted the Christian faith; but they were much misrepresented, and cruelly treated by their adversaries;—which probably was the

¹ Saint-Pacome.

² Bibl. Univers. xii. p. 376.

³ Bibl. Univ. xi. p. 13.

⁴ Cod. Apocr. N. T. p. 307.

⁵ Origen *apud* Euseb. E. H. vi. 38.

⁶ It was probably with a view of humouring the prejudices of his Pagan converts, that he instituted the *Natalitia*, or yearly commemoration of the *deaths*, or heavenly *birthdays*, of the Martyrs. Out of this custom, built upon a well-known heathen practice, subsequently arose the veneration of relics, the canonization of Saints, and other idolatrous practices of the Romish Church. (See below.)—EDIT.

case of many other ancient heretics. The Christians of every sect and denomination, the Eastern Pagans, the Mahometans, and the Jews, have all agreed in hating the Manichæans. Their books are lost; for it was an old custom with the Christians to burn heretical writings, and to forbid the reading of them. The accounts therefore which we have of ancient heretics are usually very imperfect, and not to be depended upon; for the orthodox, either through resentment or ignorance, have not done them justice.

Manichæus pretended to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ, and a prophet illuminated by the Paraclete, to reform all religions, and to reveal those truths which our Saviour thought it not proper to commit to his first disciples. This was his imposture, or his fanaticism; for he pretended not himself to be the Holy Ghost, though he has been accused of it. By virtue of this divine mission, he rejected the Old and reformed the New Testament. He pretended either that the Gospels were not the work of Apostles or apostolical men whose names they bear, or that, if they were, they had been falsified by Judaising Christians; but it appears not that he or his followers took upon them to curtail or interpolate the New Testament.

Having denied the inspiration, or at least the superior authority of the Hebrew prophets, he opposed to them other prophets, whose books the Eastern nations pretended to have preserved. He affirmed that every nation had been favoured with prophets, and that the Christian Church, being chiefly composed of Gentiles, ought to be guided by those illuminated Gentile teachers, and not by Hebrew instructors.

He admitted the authority of Apocryphal Books composed to maintain the heresies of the *Docetæ* and of the *Encratites*, whose notions he also adopted:—those of the former, who held that Christ had only the appearance of a man; and those of the latter, who condemned marriage and the use of animal food.

Manichæus believed that the divine nature was extended and limited: but as he limited not the divine perfections, his error was the less noxious, nor were some of the Fathers free from it.

He held a Trinity, and the consubstantiality of the persons, but he thought them as really distinct as three men. We must not hence charge him with Tritheism, unless we would involve

in the same charge many of the most illustrious Fathers, who were in the same sentiment.

He acknowledged only one God, to whom he ascribed all the attributes that seemed to him to belong to a being supremely perfect. Having no idea of a substance without place and extension, he conceived the divinity to be a living immaterial *Light*, which had resided from all eternity in the highest heaven, accompanied with pure and immortal spirits, whom he called *Æons*, and who were emanations of the divine essence. This was a Platonic notion. Yet were these *Æons* infinitely beneath their author, and not, properly speaking, gods.

The highest heaven, and the intelligent agents who inhabit it, compose the intellectual world, which is eternal. The luminous substance, of which heaven is formed, is coeternal with God; it is also self-existent, since from nothing nothing can proceed; but the heaven and the *Æons* have only a secondary eternity, since they have a cause, which is God; yet as this cause has operated from all eternity, they are likewise eternal. This also was Platonic.

From the essence of the Father have emanated two persons, the Son and the Holy Ghost. These two emanations are far superior to all the others; they are consubstantial with the Father, but subordinate; and they have not absolute independency, which belongs to him alone. The first of these, since the formation of the material world, resides in the sun and moon; the second in the air. There they execute the orders of the Father, and there they will remain, till the consummation of the age. In this part of the Manichæan system, there are notions not remote from the Hebrew and the Egyptian Theology.

In a corner of infinite space resided from all eternity an evil power, which Manichæus called *matter* in philosophic style, the *devil* in vulgar style, and *darkness* in mystical language, which was that of the *Magi*. The empire of this power was divided into five regions, the uppermost of which surrounded and contained within it the rest. Each of these regions had one of the elements of matter, together with living animals formed out of it; each had also its ruling prince; but all were under the dominion of the *great prince*, the sole head of the evil powers.

These two empires being thus divided by I know not what

bounds, God knew the *darkness*, but the *darkness* knew not him, nor the *light* ; nor would ever have known the happy realms, if a sedition, which arose in it, had not caused the powers of darkness to come forth from their limits. Seeing the light, they projected to make an irruption into that kingdom, and to seize it. God opposed to them a power called *the first man*, who was armed with the five elements of the celestial substance. Among these elements was that of light, by which was probably meant the human soul. But this first man being too weak for his adversaries, God sent to his aid a second power, called *the living spirit*, who delivered him. However, the dæmons having seized a part of the heavenly substance, light and darkness became blended together. This fable was intended as a solution of the origin of natural and moral evil.

The living spirit having conquered the dæmons, chained them in the air ; leaving them no more liberty than he judged suitable to his own designs. There, in their fury, they are the cause of tempests, thunder, lightning, rain, and contagious distempers.

The two substances being mixed, the living spirit judged that he could make something grand and beautiful out of them ; and indeed this was the intention of the Supreme God in permitting this mixture. The spirit began then by separating the parts of the celestial substance, which were preserved from the contagion of matter ; and of them he formed the sun and moon. Of those, which were corrupted only in a small degree, he made the planets, and the lower heaven. The rest remained confounded with the material substance, and it was all employed in forming our sublunary world, where good and evil are intermixed.

As human souls were the most excellent parts of the celestial substance, which the princes of darkness had seized, they contrived to retain them. The great prince formed two organised bodies upon the model of the *first man*, whom he had beheld. He made them of different sexes, and in them he inclosed the first souls which he had taken. His project was to charm them by the sweet impressions of the senses, to make them love their prisons, and to incline them irresistibly to perpetuate their captivity by the allurements of concupiscence : and, as generation continues to produce bodies resembling the two first, the souls, which flutter in the air and are dispersed

everywhere in these lower regions, imprudently enter into the corporeal prisons which concupiscence continually produces, and prepares for their reception. There they willingly continue, enamoured with their habitation.

Souls, being of celestial origin, have by nature the seeds of virtue, and the knowledge of duty; but when they are united to bodies, they drink in the cup of oblivion a pernicious poison, which deprives them of their memory. That was Platonic.

To remedy this inconvenience, the Divine Providence at first made use of the ministry of good angels, who taught the ancient patriarchs salutary truths. These transmitted the knowledge of them to their descendants; and, that this light might never be totally extinguished, God has not ceased to raise up in all times and in all nations wise men and prophets, till at last it pleased him to send his Son into the world. This divine minister instructed human souls concerning their true origin, the causes of their captivity, and the means of their deliverance. After having wrought innumerable miracles to confirm his doctrine, he taught them, by his mystical crucifixion, how they ought to mortify the flesh with its affections. He also showed them, by his mystical resurrection and ascension, that death destroys not the man, but only breaks his prison; and restores to purified souls the liberty of returning to their heavenly country.

Flesh being composed of matter, and of the most vicious part of matter, it followed thence that the Son of God could only take the figure, not the real nature of man. Therefore Manichæus denied the incarnation, and the birth of Christ from a virgin. He denied also that Christ made use of food for his sustenance; that he had a soul susceptible of the innocent affections; that he suffered, died, and rose again. He acknowledged that all this was done in appearance, but not in reality. He denied also the resurrection of the flesh, since that would be a perpetuating of those evils of which the flesh is the cause. He *disapproved* of marriage, as being the invention of the devils, to tie the souls to the flesh, and to retard their return to heaven. He strongly recommended all the austerities which serve to mortify the body; and, for the same reason, he *disapproved* of the use of wine and of flesh, pretending that it nourished the body too much, and inflamed concupiscence.

He required of his *elect*, or the *perfect*, that they should embrace a voluntary poverty, and meddle with no secular affairs.

This heresiarch knew well, that, as concupiscence has such an empire over the mind, it would be a vain thing absolutely to prohibit marriage: he therefore permitted or tolerated it in the laity, as also meat, wine, and the possession of worldly goods. As all could not aspire to evangelical perfection, he used some condescension towards the weak; but as to the perfect, and particularly the Ecclesiastics, he ordered them to imitate the life of Christ, who never was married, and who had no possessions. He permitted them only the most spiritualised pleasures, such as music and perfumes. His design was to wean the soul from sensual affections, because, unless it be perfectly purified, it is not qualified for the heavenly mansions.

As it is not possible that all human souls should acquire this perfection in the present state, he admitted the transmigration of the soul; a doctrine much received by those who held its immortality. He taught that souls passed from one body to another, but that those which were not purged in a certain number of these revolutions, were delivered to the dæmons of the air, to be tormented and tamed by them; that after this severe discipline, they were sent into other bodies, as into a new school, till, having acquired a sufficient degree of purity, they traverse the region of matter, and enter into the moon; that the moon, when she is full of these spirits, which is when her surface is entirely bright, transmits them to the sun, and he sends them to that place which the Manichæans called *the Pillar of Glory*. Manichæus was not the inventor of these notions.

The Holy Ghost, who resides in the air, continually assists the souls by his salutary influences. The sun, who is composed of a pure and purifying fire, facilitates their ascent to heaven, and purges off the material particles whose weight retards their flight.

When all the souls, and all the parts of the celestial substance, shall be separated and disengaged from matter, then shall be the consummation of the age. A devouring fire shall burst forth from the caverns, in which the Creator has imprisoned it. The angel, who holds up the earth, shall let it fall into the flames, and then cast the useless mass from the limits of the world, into

the place called in Scripture *utter darkness*. There shall the devils dwell for ever; and the souls, which by indolence have not finished their purification at the time of this great catastrophe, for the chastisement of their negligence shall be appointed to guard the doors of the infernal regions, and to keep the devils confined to their prison; that they may no more make any attempts and inroads on the kingdom of God.

The punishments which God inflicts on human souls are corrective, and intended to produce reformation, and will produce this happy effect, more or less, sooner or later; but the souls, which have been so corrupted as to be found in a state of imperfection at the last day, must be doomed to this situation and employment, which may be considered rather as a deprivation of superior happiness and glory, than as actual misery.

Such is the Manichæan system.—The difficulty of conceiving a creation, and of accounting for the origin of evil, and an unwillingness to ascribe it to God, gave rise to the doctrine of two principles, one good, the other evil, or God and matter; matter eternal and uncreated, and containing in itself the seeds of incorrigible evil, natural and moral, whence sprang evil beings and their chief. This notion was very ancient, and held by Persians, Chaldæans, Indians, and other oriental nations, and thence brought into Christianity by Christian heretics. Basilides seems to have been the first who introduced it into Christianity at the beginning of the second century.

Manichæus or Manes, who was a Chaldæan or Babylonian, was born about A.D. 240; and was a learned and ingenious man, and a good astronomer and geographer. He taught that the earth was spherical, and this was one of his heresies. Eusebius was of the same opinion concerning the figure of the earth, but advances it cautiously, for fear of giving offence to the Christians of his time.

Manichæus was ordained in his youth a Presbyter in the Christian Church; but a desire of mixing his philosophical notions with Christianity, led him to make a new system out of both; which he hoped to propagate among the Persian infidels and the Christians. Upon this he was excommunicated, and then he insinuated himself into the favour of the Persian king. But his personal success was small, and he pleased neither party.

He offended the Persian Christians by his heresies; and he offended Sapor, the Persian king, and the magi, by innovating and pretending to reform the Zoroastrian doctrines and ceremonies, and was forced to fly his country. Hormizdas, son and successor of Sapor, favoured him; but a king, who reigned afterwards, is said to have put him to death, and his disciples were then persecuted in Persia. His heresy died not with him; but spread itself in Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Egypt, Greece, Africa, and Spain.

Most of the ancient heresies were a mixture of philosophy, Greek or Oriental, and of Christianity.

The most ancient sects in Christianity, after the Judaizing Christians, were the *Ebionites* and the *Docetæ*; and they were directly opposite: the first denied the *divinity*, and the second the *humanity* of Jesus Christ. St. John seems to have had them both in view, asserting against the first, that *the Word was God*; and against the second, that *the Word was made flesh*.

Manes borrowed and adopted many notions of heretics, who had appeared before him; of the *Docetæ*, and of Basilides, Marcion, Valentinus, and Bardesanes.

It is not fair to charge those who held two principles with admitting two gods, which they constantly disclaimed. All the dualists in general held that there was only one God, and looked upon the evil principle as upon a dæmon unworthy of the name of God.

The Manichæans detested evil spirits, and never paid them any honour; nor did they invoke angels or saints, but they were constant and assiduous in prayer to God. They imagined God to be extended and *corporeal*, but not *material*, and not present where the evil substance was, yet infinitely extended everywhere else. They thought that matter was endued with sense and perception, but not with any morally good quality; and that from this matter the devil was formed, not from eternity, but in time. They were not fatalists, or not more so than many Christians have been; they held a liberty in the soul to do well or ill, and also the doctrine of original sin, of divine assistance, and of the necessity of infant-baptism. When they endeavoured to prove from the New Testament, that Jesus Christ was not born of the Virgin Mary, and had not a human

body, they had recourse to miserable shuffle and chicanery; receiving the words of the sacred writers when they could wrest them to their own purpose, and rejecting them when they could not. In their morals they seem to have been as good as most of their contemporaries, and by no means scandalous; yet in this point they met with cruel usage, and were charged with shocking impurities and abominations in their religious ceremonies, and in celebrating the Lord's Supper.⁷

Augustin having reproached the Manichæans with being no other than Pagan schismatics, who had separated themselves from the body of the Gentiles, but had retained their superstitions and their idolatry, Faustus the Manichæan replied:—"The Pagans serve the Deity by temples, images, altars, victims, perfumes. As for me, I serve him in another manner, and have quite another notion of the worship which is agreeable to him. It is I myself, if I be worthy of it, who am the reasonable temple of God. I receive in me Jesus Christ his Son, the living image of the Divine Majesty. A soul instructed in the truth, is God's altar; and as to the honours and sacrifices due to him, I hold them to consist of pure and pious prayers. How then can I be a schismatical Pagan?" In this description we may discern the worship of the Christian Church, before it was altered by the mixture of numberless Pagan or Judaical ceremonies, and corrupted by secular pride. So that if Faustus be not an audacious liar, which there is no reason to think, there was nothing reprehensible in the Manichæan worship. Manichæus, who separated himself from the Catholic Church in the third century, retained the worship as he found it, and transmitted it to his followers, whilst the Catholics altered it every day by new superstitions.

This also is what Faustus fails not to retort upon Augustin, and to represent the Catholics as schismatics, who, having separated themselves from the Gentiles, had retained many of their errors and superstitions. "You have substituted," says he, "your *Agapæ* for the sacrifices of the Pagans, and for their idols your martyrs, whom you serve with the very same honours.

⁷ Cyril. Hier. *Cat.* c. 6. Ἄνδρες γὰρ τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἐνυπνιασμοῖς ἐνθυμέσθωσαν, καὶ γυναῖκες τὰ ἐν ἀφύδοις. Such remarks are not fit to be inserted in a sermon or catechism.

You appease the shades of the dead with wine and feasts ; you celebrate the solemn festivals of the Gentiles, their calends and their solstices : and as to their *manners*, those you have retained without any alteration. Nothing distinguishes you from the Pagans, except that you hold your assemblies apart from them." There is in these accusations some exaggeration and falsehood ; but it must be confessed that there is also some truth, and that Paganism had already begun to enter along with the Pagans into the church. It increased greatly in process of time.

The *Valdenses* and the *Albigenses* were persecuted and massacred, under the pretence of being Manichæans, A.D. 1022 ; which cruelty continued in Europe long afterwards against persons falsely accused of this heresy. It has been for a long time a kind of merit to accuse, and even to calumniate heretics ; and a crime to excuse them. Why should a man engage in their defence, unless he be engaged in their errors ? This spirit and temper passed from the Jews to the Christians, and has continued to this day : and so far is it carried, that to commend the learning, the eloquence, the abilities, the virtues of some illustrious sectary, is to be a favourer of heretics, and to tread the paths that lead to excommunication. The learned world is well acquainted with this Ecclesiastical policy, and not ignorant of its reasons.

Upon a fair examination it will appear that no part of history hath been more falsified and misrepresented than that which relates to sects and heresies. The frantic extravagances, the strange impurities, the detestable abominations, which have been imputed to many societies who invoked the holy name of Jesus Christ, appear to me as so many outrages done to Christianity ; and I cannot read without indignation those evidently fabulous stories of ancient sects, charged with monstrous errors and infamous ceremonies. All this is the effect of blind zeal, weak credulity, precipitation and blunder.

⁸ *Beausobre* wrote a history of these persecuted Christians, and of the Reformation in Germany, which, as I am informed, is in the hands of his relations. If they would offer proposals for printing it by subscription, it is to be hoped that all lovers of literature would join to recommend and encourage the undertaking. I can answer for one, though an inconsiderable person. [The well-known publications of Dr. Gilly, relative to these remarkable Christian communities, are more than a compensation for those of *Beausobre*. Some remarks will also be found upon them below, under the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.—EDIT.]

For what more specious argument against Christianity, than this multitude of sects, seeming to vie with one another which should have the honour to invent the most absurd opinions, and the most profane and ungodly rites? The Pagan philosophers failed not to make their advantage of it, and by it to expose Christianity to the contempt and hatred of the people. It is true that the philosophers, who passed over from Judaism and Paganism to Christianity, corrupted the simplicity of the gospel, and turned it into a contentious religion, and filled it with unedifying speculations: but as to impure and abominable mysteries, either they who practised them were not Christians, but true Pagans, or those pretended mysteries were fable and fiction.

The Christians accused Manes of being a magician upon very slender grounds. If he had done what Saint Macarius did, there would have been more reason for the suspicion. Palladius, in his history of this Monk, tells us, that, having interrogated a human skull, the skull answered him, and let him into all the mystery of the state of the dead. It must be confessed that this miracle has a very magical air, and that, without the best attestations in the world of being a sound Catholic, whosoever should do as much in the territories of the Holy Inquisition, would run a great risk of being sent to see whether the skull had given a true account.

Fasting is a kind of austerity too much esteemed in the East, to have been neglected by the Manichæans. The Syrians in general, under which name I comprehend all the communions of the Levant, and the nations beyond Syria, are naturally very austere. Thence it came to pass, that Monkery, born and nursed in Egypt, made a great and rapid progress amongst the Syrians: thence the *Stylitæ*, so famous in those parts, whom some heretics called *holy birds*, and *martyrs in the air*. The Easterns are very sober, and in Persia the sobriety of the Westerns would be accounted no better than intemperance. The Syrians are perhaps the greatest fasters in the universe. Of the three hundred and sixty-five days of the year, they have one hundred and sixty of fixed fasts, without counting the weekly fasts of Wednesday and Friday, observed in all Eastern communions. I cannot forbear citing on this occasion a passage from the

Moral System of the *Guebres*, or ancient Persians. “When others keep a fast, the meaning is, that they eat nothing before dinner: our fast consists in endeavouring to restrain the organs of our body, our hands, our eyes, our tongues, from all sin. It is better to abstain from concupiscence and vice, than from food.” This indeed is the fast recommended by the prophets; but it is the least brilliant, and the most difficult, and not at all calculated to please hypocrites.

Thus far from Beausobre, to which I add:—

Manes drew up a Theological system, and entered into a minute detail of things transacted before Adam; for which he had no proofs to give from Scripture or from reason, and therefore thought it convenient to pretend to inspiration. If a man had asked him, “Where wast *thou*, when the *Dæmons* brake prison, and fought with the *First Man* and with the *Living Spirit*?” he must have replied, “The Lord has revealed these things to his servant Manes.” To which the other might have said, “Foretell us then future events, and work some miracles, that we may be satisfied of thy mission: and then it will be time enough to take thy marvellous doctrines into consideration.”

It may seem strange that he had disciples; but it will seem so only to those who consider not what passes in the world. Manes was bold, ingenious, learned, and insinuating; but men, who resembled him in nothing besides effrontery, have found admirers and followers. Jerome says, *Nullus potest hæresin struere, nisi qui ardentis ingenii est, et habet dona naturæ, quæ a Deo artifice sunt creata.* It is usually as Jerome observes; but to this general rule there are exceptions. *Multum refert in quæ tempora cujusque virtus inciderit.* Sometimes the most frantic enthusiast, or the most absurd and unintelligible mortal shall be the author of a doctrine or of a system, and shall beget sons and daughters after his own image and similitude. True it is that such a sect seldom holds out for above half a century, or descends beyond the second generation; as amongst the brutes, a mule, whose sire is an ass, leaves no posterity, and is the last of the family.

The heresies, which arose amongst Christians, admitted the truth of the Christian religion, and were a sort of Christianity; though sometimes so corrupted and adulterated as hardly to

deserve that appellation. Mohammedism itself made some concessions to the Jews and to the Christians; and, if the author of it had denied the divine mission of Moses and of Christ, he would not have gathered five disciples. Christianity on the contrary entered into no composition with Paganism, but absolutely condemned the whole system of Idolatry; and so had stronger prejudices to contend with, and yet was triumphant.

The Manichæans gave to each man two souls, the one a good, the other a bad one. Clemens Alexandrinus mentions an odd and ridiculous notion, held by some heretics, that God made man down to the navel, and that the rest of him was made by another power. Ἐντεῦθεν ἄλλοι τινὲς κινηθέντες, μικροὶ καὶ οὐτιδανοὶ, τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑπὸ διαφόρων δυνάμεων πλασθῆναι λέγουσι, καὶ τὰ μὲν μέχρ' ὀμφαλοῦ θειοδεστέρας τέχνης εἶναι· τὰ ἔνερθε δὲ, τῆς ἥττονος· οὐ δὲ χάριν, ὀρέγεσθαι συνουσίας.⁹ Theodoret says that the Eunomians, as well as the Marcionites, held that there were two principles; and that the lower parts of the human body came from the evil principle. He probably misrepresents the Eunomians, for what has Arianism to do with Manichæism? Eunomius was an Arian indeed, and the father of an Arian sect; yet as far as we can judge from his writings, some of which are still extant and have escaped burning, he was no more a Manichæan than Epiphanius, or Athanasius, or Jerome, or Theodoret.¹

The Eunomians seem to have been of opinion that it was not necessary for persons to be plunged all over in water, and that it was not decent for them to be stripped at the performance of this religious rite. They therefore only uncovered them to the breast, and then poured water upon their heads. This was enough to give their adversaries a pretext, though a poor one, to calumniate them, and to call them *Manichæans*, and to charge them with holding that the lower parts of the body were made

⁹ Strom. iii. p. 526.

¹ Fabricius *Bibl. Gr.* viii. 251. Theodoritus (L. iv. *Hæreticarum fabularum*, cap. 3) inter alia Eunomianis tribuit, quod et ipsi cum Marcione duo rerum principia, malum et bonum, statuerint; et inferiores partes a malo principio ortas, et hinc non totum baptizandum esse hominem, docuerint. Cui congruit quod S. Ambrosius Eunomianos jungit Marcionistis (L. i. de officiis c. 2, ad quem locum conferendæ notæ Monachor. Benedictin. Tom. ii. p. 31.)

by the devil.² That they worshipped Eunomius, and placed his writings above the New Testament, and despised the martyrs, are some of Jerome's usual figures of rhetoric and arts of controversy, to set the populace against the Eunomians. He might as well have said that they had cloven feet, and rode upon broomsticks in the air.

S. Basnage gives too much credit to such vague and improbable accusations. Epiphanius, a dealer in hearsays, was told by somebody, that Ætius, an Arian bishop, talked loosely about fornication, and made a jest of it. *Ergo*, the Eunomians and the Arians were as corrupted in their manners, as in their principles. What a weak and halting inference from precarious premises!

If the Eunomians rebaptised those who had already been

² S. Basnage Ann. ii. 861. *Eunomius ritus baptismi immutavit, qua de re accusatum fuisse fatetur Philostorgius. Testis potentissimus mutationis est Epiphanius: "Qui jam baptizati sunt, iterum baptizat Eunomius, non modo qui a Catholicis, aut ab aliis hæresibus, sed eos etiam qui ab ipsismet Arianis deficiunt. Repetiti porro illius baptismatis ea formula est, 'In nomine Dei increati, et in nomine Filii creati, et in nomine Spiritus sanctificantis, et a creato Filio procreati.'"* *Aliam tamen adhibuisse formulam in Theodorito legimus: "Dicit non oportere ter immergere eum qui baptizatur, nec Trinitatem invocare, sed semel baptizare in mortem Christi."* *Risum an lacrimis prosequenda, quæ de Eunomiani baptismi ritibus a Veteribus sunt memoria mandata? Epiphanius: "Sunt qui narrent, quotquot ab iis denuo baptizantur in caput demergi, pedibus in sublime porrectis, et sic jusjurandum adigi, nunquam se ab illius hæresi discessuros."* *Observat et Nicetas: "Longissimâ fasciâ, eum in usum paratâ consecratâque, hominem a pectore usque ad extremos pedum articulos invollebant, tum deinde superiores corporis partes aqua proluebant."* *Cujus ritus causa hæc fuit, quod inferioribus corporis partibus pollui aquam arbitrabantur. Tantum superstitio potuit suadere malorum!* *"Baptizatos ad pectus usque aqua madefaciunt, inquit Theodoritus, reliquis autem partibus corporis, tanquam abominandis, aquam adhibere prohibent."* *Discipulis Eunomii Ecclesias visitare moris non erat. "Omnes sectatores ejus Basilicas Apostolorum et Martyrum non ingrediuntur, ut scilicet mortuum adorent Eunomium, cujus libros majoris authoritatis arbitrantur quam Evangelia."* (Hieronymus.) *Neque castiores doctrinæ mores fuere, si vera de Ætio prædicat Epiphanius: "Cum quidam ob stuprum feminæ illatum accusarentur, et ab aliis damnarentur, nihil illum commotum: sed factum risu et ludibrio prosequentem dixisse, Nullius hoc esse momenti: corporis enim hanc esse necessitatem."* Observe that the testimonies of Epiphanius and of Theodoret, concerning the form of Eunomian baptism, contradict each other. We may suppose that the Eunomians used only one *immersion*, or rather *superinfusion*, and that they baptised in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as they were plainly directed to do by the Scriptures; to which they paid as much regard as the Consubstantialists. When Epiphanius says of their baptism, *sunt qui narrent*; we may be sure that proofs ran very low with him.

baptised by Christians, they were much to be blamed for it; but the same fault was committed by Athanasius, and by those Consubstantialists who rejected Arian baptism as invalid and null.

I know not whether this Manichæan conceit of a double soul suggested to the first Lord Shaftesbury an ingenious thought. "He was wont to say, that there was in every one two men, the wise and the foolish, and that each of them must be allowed his turn. If you would have the wise, the grave, and the serious always to rule and have the sway, the fool would grow so peevish and troublesome, that he would put the wise man out of order, and make him fit for nothing. He must have his times of being let loose to follow his fancies and play his gambols, if you would have your business go on smoothly."³ From such a passage as this, some of the ancients would have concluded that Shaftesbury was a Manichæan.

Manes placed the Father in heaven, the Son in the sun and moon, and the Holy Ghost in the air: and in this notion of the Son, or the *Λόγος*, he seems to have adopted what the Persians held concerning *Mithras*. By the account of Sozomen,⁴ it appears that in the fourth century the sun was the favourite deity of the Persians, as he had been of old, and he whom they most worshipped. The learned and philosophical Persians might perhaps honour the sun only as the symbol of the divinity; but the multitude, without question, terminated their worship in the sun, and he was their god; not the supreme, but the next to him.

The Oriental theology contains some traces of a Trinity. We find in the Chaldæan or Zoroastrian Oracles, which were published by Stanley, and then by Le Clerc in his Philosophical Works:—

Πάντι γὰρ ἐν κόσμῳ λάμπει Τριάς, ἧς Μονὰς ἄρχει.

But this Oracle seems to be the forgery or interpolation of some Christian, or some Platonic philosopher, and the whole collection to be, not only a stupid and senseless rhapsody, but spurious and of no authority.

The Manichæan notion that the souls of the righteous went to the moon, agrees well enough with the Stoical doctrine, thus delivered by Lucan⁵:—

³ Locke's *Memoirs*.

⁴ E. H. ii. 9, &c.

⁵ Phars. ix. 6.

Quodque patet terras inter, lunæque meatus,
Semidei Manes habitant, quos ignea virtus
Innocuos vita, patientes ætheris imi
Fecit, et æternos animam collegit in orbes.⁶

Manichæus, says Augustin, thought that the moon was made of pure water, and the sun of pure fire. He would have been surprised, if he had been informed that the moon has neither water nor atmosphere.

The Manichæans held that all should terminate in good, as far as human souls are concerned. Some of the *Dualists* seem also to have supposed that all moral and natural evil should cease at last, and the evil principle be abolished. But this opinion, if strictly considered, is by no means consistent with the doctrine of two principles; for if evil be unoriginated and self-existing, it must be indestructible, and, though its modifications may be varied, it will remain in one shape or other. Yet the destruction of *Arimanius* and *Hades*, and the future felicity of mankind is so set forth by some Dualists.⁷

The perfect Manichæans abhorred wine, which they called *the gall of the Prince of Darkness*. Others before them had held wine in abomination, as being *the blood of the Giants*. Ἡρξαντο δὲ πίνειν ἀπὸ Ψαμμητίκου, πρότερον δὲ οὐκ ἔπινον οἶνον, οὐδὲ ἔσπενδον ὡς φίλιον θεοῖς, ἀλλ' ὡς αἷμα τῶν πολεμησάντων ποτὲ τοῖς θεοῖς, ἐξ ὧν οἴονται πεσόντων καὶ τῇ γῇ συμμιγέντων ἀμπέλους γένεσθαι· διὸ καὶ τὸ μεθύειν ἔκφρονας ποιεῖ καὶ παραπλῆγας, ἅτε δὴ τῶν προγόνων τοῦ αἵματος ἐμπιπλαμένους.⁸ Perhaps Androcydes had this fable in view:—*Androcydes sapientia clarus ad Alexandrum Magnum scripsit, intemperantiam ejus cohibens: Vinum poturus, Rex, memento te bibere sanguinem Terræ.*⁹

Jerome, Ambrose, and other Fathers have declaimed against matrimony, and recommended monkish abstinence, almost as

⁶ See Lipsius *Phys. Stoic.* iii. 14.

⁷ Plutarch *de Iside*:—Ἐπεισι δὲ χρόνος εἰμαρμένος, ἐν ᾧ τὸν Ἀρειμάνιον, λοιμὸν ἐπάγοντα καὶ λιμὸν, ὑπὸ τούτων ἀνάγκη φθαρῆναι παντάπασι καὶ ἀφανισθῆναι, τῆς δὲ γῆς ἐπιπέδου καὶ ὁμαλῆς γενομένης, ἓνα βίον καὶ μίαν πολιτείαν ἀνθρώπων μακαρίων καὶ ὁμωγλώσσω ἀπάντων γενέσθαι.

Theopompus, *Ibid.* Τέλος ἀπολείπεσθαι [ἀπολείσθαι] τὸν Ἄδην, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀνθρώπους εὐδαίμονας ἔσεσθαι, μήτε τροφῆς δεομένους μήτε σκιὰν ποιούντας· τὸν δὲ ταῦτα μηχανησάμενον [μηχανησόμενον] θεὸν ἡρεμεῖν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθαι χρόνῳ καλῶς [χρόνος, ἄλλως] μὲν οὐ πολὺν τῷ θεῷ, ὥσπερ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ κοιμωμένῳ μέτριον.

⁸ Plutarch *de Iside*.

⁹ Plin. N. H. xiv. 5.

much as Manes; and have employed arguments as insignificant as those of the heretic.

Philosophy, natural, moral, and theological, has received such great improvements in this and the last century, by the labours of the learned, and particularly the learned of this nation,¹ and the Manichæan hypothesis is so very weak in all its parts, that there is no danger in exposing it fairly and impartially to public view, and no occasion for the mean artifice of misrepresenting it, and of charging its favourers with follies and enormities of which they were not guilty.² To suppose that matter, which is limited, dispersed, passive, and ever-divisible, is self-existing, independent, endued with sense, perception, life and motion, essentially evil, and necessarily vicious; to add to this the spontaneous generation of evil dæmons, and other evil beings, out of this matter; to suppose God corporeally extended, and excluded from those parts of space which are occupied by body, but in all other respects perfect; is a system so unphilosophical, that it can never hold up its head or make its fortune in these days, or, at least, it can never be adopted by men of any sense and judgment.

Milton,³ judiciously, introduces Satan talking of his origin and generation, according to the Manichæan system.

That we were form'd then, say'st thou? and the work
Of secondary hands, by task transferr'd
From Father to his Son? Strange point, and new!
Doctrine which we would know whence learn'd: who saw
When this creation was? Remember'st thou
Thy making, while the Maker gave thee being?
We know no time when we were not as now;
Know none before us: self-begot, self-rais'd
By our own quick'ning pow'r, when fatal course
Had circled his full orb, the birth mature
Of this our native heav'n.

Bayle took a singular delight in adorning and improving the Manichæan objections against the doctrine of one self-existing principle, and endeavoured to show that, upon the supposition that God is the author of all things, it is impossible to defend his wisdom and his goodness against the difficulties, which arise

¹ Cudworth, Boyle, Locke, Newton, &c.

² See, in Bayle's Dict., the *Adamites* and the *Turlupins*; who probably have been wronged as well as the *Manichæans*.

³ P. L. v. 853.

from his causing or permitting natural and moral evil. On the other hand he was very willing to allow that the Manichæan system was indefensible. The result of all this was, according to him, the triumph of scepticism, and the futility of human reason. Many replies were made, and amongst others Le Clerc undertook to defend the justice, wisdom, and goodness of God against him; first in his *Parrhasiana*, and then in his *Bibliothèque Choisie*; in which controversy he had manifestly the advantage over Bayle.

XXIV. OF CYPRIAN, AND OTHERS, TO THE REIGN OF CONSTANTINE.

1. CYPRIAN was made bishop of Carthage, A.D. 248. It has been said of him that he was fond of spiritual power; and it cannot entirely be denied: but he had factious Ecclesiastics and troublesome Schismatics to deal with, which might lead him to insist somewhat the more on his prerogatives; and it is certain that in one point he was for restraining episcopal encroachments. He highly approved and recommended the method of appealing to the people in the election of bishops, and of asking their consent and approbation, and of allowing them a negative. He thought that the bishops of a province had no right to make a cabal, and elect a bishop secretly by themselves, and obtrude him upon the church. But after Christianity was the established and the ruling religion, great inconveniences, and tumults, and seditions, and massacres arose from the popular elections of bishops; and Ecclesiastical preferments became more 'lucrative, and were thought more worthy of a battle, or of mean tricks and solicitations. *Omnium rerum vicissitudo est.* Cyprian upon all occasions⁵ consulted his own clergy and people, and desired their consent. The bishops of Rome at that time began to take upon them, and to domineer;

⁴ *Bonifacius*, Decret. part iii. de Consecrat. distinct. i. can. 44. Cum ligneis utemur calicibus, aureos sacerdotes habebamus: nunc aureos habemus calices, ligneos sacerdotes.

⁵ *Episcopus sine consilio clericorum suorum clericos non ordinet, et civium testimonium quærat.* So say the Canons of the fourth Council of Carthage (A.D. 398), if they be genuine. The Canon, however, is very reasonable.

and Stephen, dealing about his censures and excommunications, behaved himself with indecency and arrogance towards Cyprian and many others, in the affair of rebaptising.

In a council of Carthage, consisting of eighty-seven bishops, Cyprian said to them, *None of us ought to set himself up as a bishop of bishops, or pretend tyrannically to constrain his colleagues, because each bishop has a liberty and a power to act as he thinks fit, and can no more be judged by another bishop, than he can judge another. But we must all wait for the judgment of Jesus Christ, to whom alone belongs the power to set us over the church, and to judge of our actions.* Du Pin inserted these words in his *Bibliotheca*, to buffet the pope by the hand of Cyprian. Many passages there are in Cyprian's writings, containing high notions of Episcopal authority and Ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Whilst he strenuously opposed the domination of one pope, he seemed in some manner to make as many popes as bishops, and mere *arithmetical noughts* of the rest of the Christians; which yet, I believe, was not his intent.

In the persecution under Decius, he fled from Carthage, and was proscribed, and his effects were seized. He was censured by some persons as a deserter of his flock; but the decent constancy and the Christian piety, with which he laid down his life afterwards, afford a presumption that he had not retired for want of courage. His death was lamented even by many of the Pagans, whose esteem he had gained by his affable and charitable behaviour.

He often talks of his visions and revelations, some of which he had on occasions, which in all appearance were small and inconsiderable enough; whilst he had none to guide him and set him right in points of more importance. He appeals to these visions, and makes use of them to justify his conduct. It would be dealing too severely with him, considering his character in other respects, to ascribe this entirely to artifice and policy; and it would be more candid and charitable to suppose that, with much piety, he had a mixture of African enthusiasm; and that what he thought upon in the day, he dreamed of at night, and the next morning took his dreams for divine admo-

⁶ Biblioth. i. p. 164.

nitions. Some perhaps will choose to leave it ambiguous, *dum Elias venerit*. In his treatise *de Lapsis*, he relates some strange miracles; one of which is, that the *consecrated bread* was turned into a 'cinder, in the hands of a profane person; who thus found, according to the proverb, *Pro thesauro carbones*. When the Corinthians showed a want of reverence and decency in receiving the Lord's Supper, what was the consequence? *For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.*⁸ The correction was solemn and tremendous. But of these *transformations* what can we say? And how can we give credit to them?

There is a story of the same kind, of *bread* turned into a *stone*, related by Sozomen.⁹ An heretic, of the sect of the Macedonians, had a wife of the same sect. The man was converted by Chrysostom, and used many arguments, in vain, to bring over his stubborn spouse. At last he told her, that if she would not receive the Lord's Supper with him at church, he would live with her no longer. She consented, but was resolved to deceive him, and instead of eating the bread which the minister gave her, she took some which she had brought with her; but as she was biting it, it was turned into a stone in her mouth;—a stone, neither in substance or colour like other stones, and bearing upon it the impression of her teeth; which made her repent, and publicly confess her crime. This happened about the end of the fourth century; and Sozomen can supply us with a hundred miracles as good. His sending

⁷ Macarius of Alexandria, a celebrated monk and saint of the fourth century, is said to have related this story:—that when the monks approached to the holy communion, and stretched out their hand to receive it, devils, under the figure of little ugly Æthiopian boys (who were only visible to Macarius), prevented the officiating priest, and gave to some of them coals instead of the consecrated bread; which bread, though to by-standers it seemed to be given by the priest and received by these monks, returned back again to the altar: whilst other monks, who were more pious and better disposed, when they approached to receive the Sacrament, chased the evil spirits away, who fled with great terror and precipitation, because an angel, who assisted at the altar, put his hand upon the hand of the Presbyter, when he delivered the Sacrament to these good men. This account is in the *Vitæ Patrum*; and inserted, with a thousand more stories of the same kind, in Tillemont (*H. E.* viii. 641). To such a degree the boldness of feigning miracles, and the facility of admitting them, was carried in those days!

⁸ 1 Cor. xi. 30.

⁹ E. H. viii. 5.

unbelievers to the church to look at the stone, which was kept there as a rarity, was *very judicious* !¹

¹ We have an account of a far prettier and stranger stone than this in Morhof (*Polyhist.* i. 13. p. 127), who had it from some editions of Thuanus :—*Mirabilis istius lapidis historia animo obversatur, Regi Galliae Henrico secundo per ignotum aliquem barbarum oblata. Illam quidem narrat Thuanus, in prima illa editione minori Parisiana* (part. i. lib. 5. p. 453). *Reperitur et in Francofurtensi prima in folio, alteraque octavae formæ* (lib. 6. p. ibi 217, hic 286). *Sed in ceteris editionibus verba illa, nescio quam ob causam, sublata. Pipinus, ad cujus testimonium provocat Thuanus, de eo ita ad Mizaldum scribit* : “ Nuper ex India Orientali Regi nostro allatum hic vidimus lapidem, lumine et fulgore mirabiliter coruscantem ; quique totus veluti ardens et incensus incredibili lucis splendore præfulget micatque. Is jactis quoque versus radiis ambientem circumquaque aërem luce, nullis oculis fere tolerabili, latissime complet. Est etiam (quod bene notari velim) terræ impatientissimus : si cooperiri coneris, sua sponte et vi, facto impetu, confestim evolat in sublime. Contineri vero includive loco nullo angusto nulla potest hominum arte, sed ampla liberaque loca duntaxat amare videtur. Summa in eo puritas, summus nitor : nulla sorde aut labe coinquinatur. Figuræ species nulla ei certa, sed inconstans et momento commutabilis : cumque sit aspectu longe pulcherrimus, contrectari sese tamen non sinit, et si diutius adnitaris, vel obstinatius agas, incommodum affert : sicuti multi suo non levi malo, me præsentem, sunt experti. Quod si quid fortassis ex eo enixius conando adimitur, aut detrahitur, nam durus admodum non est, fit, dictu mirum, nihilo minor.” *Hæc Pipinis, quæ miranda sunt, etc.*

Some part of this description may suit well enough with a *Phosphorus* : but there seems to be a double meaning, and perhaps by the *stone* we are to understand an *allegorical* and *philosophical stone*, representing *Urim* and *Thummim*, *Light* and *Truth* ; a present fit to be made to kings, though seldom acceptable to them ; a jewel whose lustre is sometimes too bright and dazzling for mortal eyes ; which cannot be suppressed, diminished, and adulterated, but will prevail and triumph at last :—

Merses profundo, pulcrior evenit :

Luctere, multa proruit integrum

Cum laude victorem :

and which it is not safe to handle too much, for fear of burning one's fingers. Is there any absurdity in supposing that this *precious oriental stone*, which would not bear confinement, was the *Holy Bible* ; a copy or translation of which might have been presented to the King ? The third, and beautiful edition of the New Testament, by Robert Stephens, was printed, with royal types, by the King's printer, and dedicated to King Henry the Second.

Mizaldus (in French *Antoine Mizaud*) wrote many books ; as, *De Aeromantia*, *De secretis hortorum*, *Planetologia*, *Secret de la Lune*, *Centuries*, etc. He was a trifling author, and a philosopher *minorum gentium*. The description which Pipinus gives of the *stone*, besides its allegorical meaning, contains an oblique banter of the *philosopher's stone*.

One *Comiers* wrote a book called *Traité des Phosphores* ; in which he is of opinion that this *stone* was a *Phosphorus* :—*Clarissimus Autor varia phosphorum artificialium genera describit ; atque, ut tam admirabilis inventi gloriam patriæ suæ vindicet, jam olim Fernelio, Henrici secundi Medico famigeratissimo, cognitum fuisse modum parandi*

I would willingly have paid a greater deference to the authority and testimony of this pious Father and Martyr concerning visions and miracles; and if I dissent from him, it is not without some reluctance. I have no notion of differing from worthy persons, living or dead, for the sake of *singularity* or of *contradiction*, in which I can discern no charms, and neither pleasure nor profit. To an *opinion* commonly received, and received by good men, when I cannot assent, I am inclined to say, *Invitus, Regina, tuo de litore cessi*. But alas! *Opinion* is a queen who will not accept of such excuses:—

*Ille solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat;
Nec magis incepto vultum sermone movetur,
Quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes.*

Origen and other ancient Christians ascribe to our Saviour this saying, Γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζίται, τὰ μὲν ἀποδοκιμάζοντες, τὸ δὲ καλὸν κατέχοντες: that is, *Act like skilful bankers, rejecting what is bad, and retaining what is good*. This precept is proper for all who apply themselves to the study of religious antiquities. Good and bad money is offered to them; and they ought to beware of the coin which will not pass current in the republic of letters, and in the critical world; and of that which is found light, when weighed in the balance of the sanctuary.²

2. *Dionysius*, bishop of Alexandria, A.D. 250, in a letter to *Fabius*,¹ bishop of Antioch, relates to him the following story:—"There was in our city an old Christian, one *Serapion*, whose conduct in other respects had ever been unblameable and exemplary,

phosphorum siccum fulgurantem, qui nunc communiter Kraftio adscribitur, et de ejus stupendis effectibus ipsum prolixè ac perspicue (lib. ii. de abditis rerum causis, c. 17) egisse, affirmat. Is enim lapis Indicus lucidissimus, quem, Bononiæ, Regi oblatum Thuanus memorat, et cujus mentionem Fernelius loc. alleg. facit, juxta Comierium Phosphorus fuit, a Fernelio arte factus, et per hominem ex India venientem in aulam missus, ut tanto pluris æstimaretur, nec, quum ejus compositio vulgaris facilisque esset, vilesceret. Verum an hæc ita recte dicta sint, viderint alii. Certe qui Fernelium legit, haud obscure sentiet, historiolum de lapide ex India allato ænigma ignis et flammæ esse, quo fortasse Fernelius aliquibus suæ artis ac sectæ viris illudere voluit. (Acta Erudit. 1684, p. 246.

² Le Clerc has drawn up an account of *Cyprian* in his *Bibl. Univ.* xii. 207. See also *Barbeyrac, Morale des Pères*, p. 131. [Mr. G. A. POOLE has lately published "the Life and Times of St. Cyprian;" and Mr. J. H. Newman has edited a translation of the works of this Father, made by Messrs. Thornton and Carey; fairly perhaps, though the source is suspicious.—EDIT.] ¹ Apud Euseb. H. E. vi. 44.

but who in the persecution had deserted, and afterwards had often begged to be forgiven and readmitted. His petition was rejected, and no regard was showed to him, because he had sacrificed. Sometime after he was taken very ill, and lay for three days senseless and speechless. On the fourth day he came to himself a little, and calling to him his grandson, 'Child,' said he, 'how long will you detain me here? Hasten, I beseech you, and release me. Go, call me one of the Presbyters.' When he had said this, he lost his speech again. The boy hastened to call a Presbyter. It was in the night-time, and the Presbyter himself was sick. But as I had ordered that pardon should be granted to all those who lay a dying, especially if they had humbly begged it before, that they might depart in faith and hope, he gave the child a portion of the Eucharist, and ordered him to *dip it in wine*,⁴ and give it to the dying man. As the youth was drawing near, the old man recovered his senses, and said, 'You are come, my child, but the Presbyter, I know, could not come himself. Do as you were ordered, and give me my dismissal.' So he received the Eucharist, and instantly gave up the ghost. Does it not appear from this that he had his time prolonged, till he was thus dismissed in peace, and that his crime was remitted, for the sake of the many good actions which he had performed in the long course of a virtuous life?"

If this wonderful thing happened just as Dionysius has related it, it tended to a good and edifying purpose, at a time when it was matter of debate in what manner *Lapsed Christians* should be treated by the church; and it showed that sinners truly penitent were not to be harshly used by their brethren, and excluded from the hopes of salvation; and that God was ready to receive those who with humility, and sorrow, and resolutions of amendment, returned to him.

This *Dionysius of Alexandria* was one of Origen's disciples; he is called by Jerome, *Vir eloquentissimus*; he was held in great esteem by Eusebius and by all the ancient Christians; and, from the large extracts of his writings produced by Eusebius, he appears to have been a learned, critical, acute,

⁴ Ἀποβρέξαι κελεύσας. *Valesius aqua intinctam*. But I think, with Louth, it should rather be rendered, *vino tinctam*.

ingenious, and elegant author. He was of an illustrious family; had received a polite education; had been a professor of rhetoric in the days of his Paganism; and afterwards was a bishop and a confessor.

He pretends to have had some visions and revelations; but whether it was really so, or whether he thought such sort of fictions harmless and lawful, or whether he had a warm imagination and was a little enthusiastical, it is impossible for us now to determine. Some of the visions and revelations of those days seem to have been vouchsafed, to teach men that they might fly in time of persecution: but such admonitions were not extremely necessary, since the dictates of nature and reason taught it, and the gospel had confirmed those dictates. *Scimus, et hoc nobis non altius imprimet Ammon.*

3. *Felix* of *Nola* is thought to have lived in the days of *Cyprian*, though that be uncertain. Many miracles were wrought in his behalf, and after his death he wrought them himself in vast abundance;—all which rests principally upon the credit of *Paulinus*, Bishop of *Nola*, a writer of the fifth century, as also upon that of *Augustine* and *Damasus*: but their united testimonies are worth just nothing at all in this case, and indeed in any case where miracles are concerned.

4. The Roman Empire under *Gallienus* (A. D. 262.), was terribly afflicted by civil war, by a multitude of usurpers and petty tyrants, by famine, and pestilence, and earthquakes, and an irruption of barbarians on all sides. The behaviour of the Christians in these calamitous times was most excellent and exemplary; as was the compassionate care which they took of the sick and needy at the hazard and at the expense of their own health, fortunes, and lives; whilst the conduct of the Pagans was the very reverse.⁵

About this time the Goths, and other savage nations which dwelt by the Danube, took some Christian Presbyters captive, and were taken captive by *them*; for these Christians, by the lovely force of a blameless behaviour and a holy life, and by the *miracles* which they wrought, converted many barbarians, and, at the same time, softened and civilised their manners. So says *Sozomen*.⁶ *Eusebius* mentions it not; but it is observable that

⁵ Euseb. E. H. vii. 22.

⁶ E. H. ii. 6.

Eusebius is often short and deficient in his account of the transactions in the *western parts*.

5. *Paul of Samosata*, Bishop of Antioch, was deposed for heresy, A. D. 270. If the account given of him by Eusebius be true, which there is no reason to suspect, he well deserved to be turned out of the church even for his wicked behaviour, and for the many proofs which he gave of being only a nominal Christian. *Les Evêques du Concile d'Antioche l'accusèrent de tous les vices ordinaires aux Evêques des grands sièges*, says Du Pin, very boldly.⁷ It is absurd to suppose that *Paul* was fool enough to call himself *Jesus Christ*; though some have charged him with it. The bishops who condemned him, accuse him of no such crime; and if he had been guilty of it, it would have been a circumstance in his favour, and a proof that he had lost his senses. They charge him indeed with affirming that *Jesus Christ* was a mere man, and with suffering himself to be called an angel come from heaven. The Synod which was assembled to examine the affair of *Paul of Samosata*, consisted of all the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, who could conveniently meet together. None were excluded.⁸

6. *Arnobius*, a valuable author, of whose works a good edition is much wanted, lived in the time of Diocletian, and wrote about the end of the third century.⁹ He was a convert to Christianity; *somniis compulsus*, says Jerome.¹ He makes some objections to Paganism, which might have been retorted on Judaism and Christianity.² He borrows much from Clemens Alexandrinus;

⁷ Bibl. Eccl. i. p. 214.

⁸ See Euseb. E. H. vii. 29, 30. From the eagerness with which, as this historian relates, the members of the synod flocked together from all quarters, in order to protest "against the defiler of Christ's flock," it is abundantly evident that his opinions were not generally, or even widely, prevalent in the early Church. *Paul* resisted the sentence of deposition; and Aurelian was incited to enforce it: this being the first instance in which the secular power was called in aid of an authoritative decision of the Church. Of the heresy of *Paul of Samosata*, which was in some sort a modification of that of *Artemon* and *Sabellius*, see Burton's *Bampton Lect.*, notes, 98-103; Newman's *Hist. of the Arians*, pp. 5-7.—EDIT.

⁹ *Arnobius* is only known to have written one work, his *Libri septem contra gentes*; the date of which, as it contains some allusions (iv. 36) to the persecution under Diocletian, cannot be earlier than A.D. 303. It has been assigned, however, to the year 297.—EDIT.

¹ Vir. Ill. c. 79.

² There are certainly some questionable statements in the work of *Arnobius*, more particularly with respect to the nature of the soul; but it should be remembered

for example, he says to the Pagans :—³ *Quis ex reliquiis Pelopis compactum esse Palladium prodidit? Non vos? Quis Spartanum fuisse Martem? Non Epicharmus auctor vester? Quis in Thraciæ finibus procreatum? non Sophocles Atticus, cunctis consentientibus theatris? Quis mensibus in Arcadia tribus et decem vinctum? Non Melæ fluminis filius?* Some words are dropped, which should be restored thus :—*theatris? Quis in Arcadia? Non vos? Quis mensibus tribus et decem vinctum? Non Melæ fluminis filius?* This is taken from Clemens Alexandrinus, who says, *Mars, according to Epicharmus, was a Spartan; according to Sophocles, a Thracian; as others say, an Arcadian; and, as Homer informs us, was tied neck and heels for thirteen months.* Ὁ ἀλλοπρόσαλλος οὗτος καὶ ἀνάρσιος, ὡς μὲν Ἐπίχαρμος φησι, Σπαρτιάτης ἦν, Σοφοκλῆς δὲ Θράκα οἶδεν αὐτόν· ἄλλοι δὲ Ἀρκάδα· τοῦτον δὲ Ὅμηρος δεδέσθαι φησὶν ἐπὶ μῆνας τρισκαίδεκα. Τλῆ μὲν Ἀρης κ. τ. λ.⁴

7. *Antony*, the monk, aged thirty-five years, retired into a desert in Egypt, A.D. 285.⁵ Athanasius has written his history,

that he wrote while yet only a catechumen, in order to prove the sincerity of his conversion, and when his knowledge of the Scriptures, and especially of the Old Testament, was very limited. It is possible, however, that he may have abstained, in some measure, from quoting them, under the impression that their authority would not be admitted by his opponents. On the other hand, his exposure of the absurdities of Paganism, from his extensive acquaintance with the ancient mythologies, is complete; and the information which he affords on the religious systems of the heathen is so valuable, that Vossius has styled him the *Varro of Christianity*. His style is animated, his arrangement methodical, and his work is altogether worthy of an attentive perusal. The best edition, containing the best notes of the earlier commentators, is that of *Orellius*, in two vols. 8vo., with an Appendix (Leipsic, 1816); and a useful edition has recently appeared on the continent, under the superintendence of *Dr. G. F. Hildebrand* (Hales. 1844).—EDIT. ³ Lib. iv. p. 143. ⁴ Cohort. c. 4.

⁵ *Anthony*, an Egyptian by birth, is generally supposed to have been the founder of the monastic orders, though Jerome, in his life of Paul the Hermit, claims that honour for his favourite recluse. In early life, Anthony was a regular attendant upon the Christian worship; and being one day forcibly struck with the text, “Go, sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor, and come and follow me” (Matt. xix. 21), he applied it literally to himself. Having made a distribution of his property among his neighbours and the poor, he abjured society, and subsequently took up his solitary abode in a ruinous tower among the mountains. Twenty years were here spent in continued and arduous struggles against his carnal appetites, which are represented as so many personal conflicts with the Devil; and he gained at length so high a reputation for sanctity, that many were induced to adopt his mode of life, and at length two regular monastic establishments were formed under his auspices. He died at the advanced age of a hundred and four years; and was buried as related in the text. His life, by Athanasius, is unquestionably, and largely, interpolated; but,

his visions, his conflicts with devils, the wonders which he wrought, and his great abomination for all heretics, particularly for the Arians. The eastern monks were in general firmly attached to the doctrine established by the Nicene council, upon which account they suffered much under the Arian Emperor Valens.⁶ Some *modern heretics*, so Tillemont calls them, have thought this life of Antony to be a spurious or a much corrupted piece;—as Rivetus, and Basnage in his *Exercitationes*. If they could have fully proved it, they would certainly have done a singular service to the *manes* of *Athanasius*. Yet Tillemont is quite angry, and says, *James Basnage, a Calvinist, has undertaken to prove that this Life is not the work of Saint Athanasius, or that it has been extremely interpolated and corrupted. He offers no new reason for this assertion that is of the least moment, and nothing remarkable, except some silly and stupid, not to say impious, jests upon things most holy and most worthy of God.*⁷ Now Basnage⁸ seems to have given into this suspicion, partly through a very favourable opinion of Athanasius, and a persuasion that he could not transmit such things to posterity; for which reason Tillemont should have treated him more civilly.

Socrates⁹ says that Antony saw the soul of Ammon the monk carried up into heaven by angels; and cites Athanasius for it, who has the very story in his Life of Antony. Sozomen relates the same tale,¹ and is thought to have taken his account of Antony from Athanasius. Du Pin is a little doubtful whether this life of Antony be genuine, but determines for the affirmative;² and upon the whole, there is far more reason to receive it as genuine, than to reject it as spurious.³

Athanasius loved the monks, and the monks loved him. One

apart from the absurd legends with which it has thus been garnished, it is a very readable biography of a studious, devout, zealous, and, in most respects, a sensible man. The reader will find a good account of Anthony in Cave's *Historia Litteraria* (vol. i. p. 150).—EDIT.

⁶ Sozomen, iii. 13; Socrates, iv. 22.

⁷ H. E. viii. p. 700.

⁸ Dissert. Epist. p. 136.

⁹ H. E. iv. 23.

¹ E. H. i. 14.

² Bibl. ii. p. 41.

³ “Ex scriptis Athanasii nullum est cui veterum plures testimonium perhibeant. Laudatur a Nazianzeno, Chrysostomo, Palladio, Hieronymo, etc. In tanta existimatione fuit de vita Antonii Liber, ut eo lecto nonnulli ad pietatem accensi fuerint.—Interea faciles largimur puram non esse, sed lutulentam nonnullis in locis fluere. Illud certe magni esse Athanasii credere non possumus, *Antonius bestiam vidit formâ humanâ ad femora usque; crura et pedes asinum, etc.*”—S. Basnage, Ann. iii. 38.

of them said to his disciples :—*When you find any fragment of the works of Athanasius, transcribe it ; and if you have no paper, write it upon your garments.* This makes it probable that Athanasius did not neglect to write the life of Antony ; and that he collected every rumour and report, which tended to embellish and magnify his friend. It is a custom with the Arabs, always to give a man a patient hearing who tells romantic stories, and never to contradict him ; and this is reckoned amongst them a rule of civility and politeness. By this rule, we must let the *Life of Antony* pass uncensured, reserving to ourselves the liberty not to believe all that is related in it.

Antony, as if he had foreseen the tricks of the relic-mongers, desired to be buried where they might not find him, and make money of him. *Ingressus montem interiorem, quem incolere solebat, post paucos menses in morbum incidit. Tum accersitis duobus Ascetis, qui propter senium laboranti ministrabant, mandata pietatis inculcat ; subjungit dein : “ ‘ Si vobis de me cura est, meique tanquam patris non obliviscimini, corpus meum in Ægyptum transferri ne patiamini, ne forte reservent domi suæ. Meum ergo corpus sepelite, terræque contegite, et nemo præter vos locum sepulcri noscat. Vestes meas sic distribuite. Meloten unam date Athanasio Episcopo, cum stragula, quam ab ipso novam accepi, nunc detritam reddo. Serapioni Episcopo alteram date meloten ; vobis cilicium servate. Quodque est reliquum, filii, salvete : Antonius enim hinc migrat, non amplius vobiscum moraturus.’* Finito sermone, postquam sunt ipsum osculati, pedibus ille porrectis, et quasi amicorum adventantium aspectu admodum lætatus, animam exhalavit.”⁴ *Illi vero præceptis Abbatis sui obtemperantes, defunctum sepeliunt in loco, qui, præterquam binis istis Ascetis, cunctis ignoratur mortalibus. At (A.D. 561.) mira Reliquiariorum sagacitas locum olfecit, ubi sacræ exuviæ recondebantur. Id scripto prodit Victor in Chronico.*⁵

⁴ Vit. Ant.

⁵ S. Basnage, Ann. ii. 834. Let us here insert the bold and generous remarks of Melchior Canus, a Dominican monk and a bishop :—“ Dolenter hoc dico potius quam contumeliose, multo a Laertio vitas Philosophorum severius scriptas, quam a Christianis vitas sanctorum, longeque incorruptius et integrius Suetonium res Caesarum exposuisse, quam exposuerint Catholici, non res dico Imperatorum, sed Martyrum, Virginum, et Confessorum. Illi enim in probis aut philosophis aut principibus, nec vitia nec suspensiones vitiorum tacent ; in improbis vero etiam colores virtutum produunt. Nostri enim plerique vel adfectibus inserviunt, vel de industria quoque ita

8. About A.D. 300, or somewhat sooner, arose a sect called *Hypsistarii*, and afterwards *Cœlicolæ*, who are mentioned in the Theodosian code, as heretics. They seem to have been persons who, rejecting idolatry, and Polytheism, and all revealed religions, admitted only natural religion.⁶ Tillemont⁷ has collected what he could find concerning this sect of *Deists* with their *Grand Master*. It is a wonder that they should have adopted the rite of baptism, unless they did it

multa confingunt, ut eorum me non solum pudeat, sed etiam tædeat. Hos enim intelligo Ecclesiæ Christi cum nihil utilitatis adtulisse, tum incommodationis plurimum. Nominibus parco, quoniam hujus loci judicium morum etiam est, et non eruditionis tantum, in qua liberior potest esse censura; nam quæ morum est, hæc debet esse et in vivos cautior, et in mortuos reverentior. Certum est autem, qui *fictæ et fallaciter Historiam Ecclesiasticam scribunt, eos viros bonos atque sinceros esse non posse*, totamque eorum narrationem esse aut ad quæstum, aut ad errorem; quorum alterum foedum est, alterum perniciosum. Justissima est Ludovici Vivis querela de historiis quibusdam in Ecclesia confictis. Prudenter ille sane ac graviter eos arguit, qui pietatis loco duxerint mendacia pro religione fingere: id quod et maxime periculosum est, et minime necessarium. Mendaci quippe homini ne verum quidem credere solemus. Quamobrem qui falsis atque mendacibus scriptis mentes mortalium invitare ad Divorum cultum voluere, hi nihil aliud mihi videntur egisse, quam ut veris, propter falsa, adimatur fides, et quæ severe ab auctoribus plane veracibus edita sunt, ea etiam revocentur in dubium." The words of Ludovicus Vives, to which Melchior Canus refers us, are these: "Quæ de (*Sanctis*) sunt scripta, præter pauca quædam, multis sunt commentis foedata, dum qui scribit affectui suo indulget, et non quæ egit Divus, sed quæ ille egisse eum vellet, exponit: ut vitam dictet animus scribentis, non veritas. Fuere qui magnæ pietatis loco ducerent mendaciola pro religione confingere: quod et periculosum est, ne veris adimatur fides propter falsa; et minime necessarium, quoniam pro pietate nostra tam multa sunt vera, ut falsa tanquam ignavi milites atque inutiles oneri sint magis quam auxilio." (*De tradendis disciplinis*, L. v.) "By all which I have ever read of the old, and have seen of the modern monks, I take the preference to be clearly due to the last, as having a more regular discipline, more good learning, and less superstition amongst them than the first." Thus Middleton: and what he says of the modern monks is just and reasonable. Many of them are to be honoured for their abilities, erudition, good sense, and humanity.

⁶ Dixi *Cœlicolas* fuisse homines nullam religionem revelatam sive veram sive falsam admittentes, sed solam naturalem, quam ratio dictat, colentes. Contra quam interpretationem vir doctus objecit, tales homines ab ævo condito semper extitisse, Honorium vero atque Augustinum de *Cœlicolis* loqui, tanquam de secta nova. At non difficile est hæc in concordiam redigere: Homines quidem singulares, ita de religione sentientes, a priscis temporibus fuerunt; sed secta fuit nova, i. e. sæculo demum tertio *Cœlicolæ* seipsos a Gentibus, Judæis, et Christianis segregare, et in societatem coire, cœperunt, electo *majore* seu patriarcha, et ritu baptismi instituto, quo in ecclesiam istam novam admitterentur. In his, quos Græci *Ἐψιστάρῃους* vocarunt, nomen suum professus erat in juventute Gregorius, pater Gregorii Nazianzeni.—Wetstenius, *Proleg.* in N. T. p. 38.

⁷ H. E. xiii. 315.

to appear to the world as a sect of Christians, and to draw in silly people.

9. Diocletian's persecution began A.D. 302. It was preceded by a great depravation of manners in the Christian church, both of the clergy and of the laity, says Eusebius. In these times of distress, as many worthy and pious bishops became martyrs and confessors, many unworthy ones were involved in the common calamity, and condemned to servile and infamous employments; and before the rage of the persecution was entirely abated, the Christian church suffered much from internal dissensions, from the cabals of ambitious men who wanted to be bishops, from irregular ordinations, and from schisms even amongst the orthodox and the confessors. Of these evils Eusebius makes slight and cursory mention; declaring that he chose to drop so melancholy a theme. He might have had good reasons for declining the task; but we cannot help wishing that we had an accurate and impartial account of the state of the church in those days. The love of governing, and the love of disputing and deciding, have been the parents of innumerable evils.⁸

Diocletian's persecution was very severe, and lasted ten years. Eusebius, who lived at that time, has given us a particular, an affecting, and an invaluable account of the martyrs under those dreadful trials. "There was," says he, "a youth not twenty years of age, brought out to suffer, who stood untied, erect, holding his arms in form of a cross, praying earnestly to God, and never stirring from his place, nor changing posture, nor showing the least sign of fear; but full of calm resolution, whilst bears and panthers made up to him, and were roaring about him." The name of this young hero is lost, whilst so many names are preserved in ecclesiastical history, which might as well have slept in neglected oblivion.

At the same time *Apphianus*, who was not twenty years old, and who had been instructed by Eusebius, endured for three days together all the torments that diabolical cruelty could contrive.⁹

⁸ De Mart. Pal. 12.

⁹ See also the account of the sufferings of Theodosia, who was not eighteen. (*Mart. Palæst.* 7.) In the persecution under Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, Ponticus, a youth of fifteen years, after he had been brought forth, day after day, to see the torments which were inflicted on the Christians, suffered them himself, and died with the utmost constancy and resolution. (*Euseb.* v. 1.)

Amongst other punishments inflicted on the Christians, one was, to crucify them with their head downwards;—¹ a barbarity which was practised in the days of Seneca, and which perhaps gave occasion to the story ² that St. Peter, at his own request, suffered this kind of martyrdom.³

Eusebius in his history of Diocletian's persecution is sparing of prodigies; but later writers have amply supplied that defect, and have mentioned ten thousand miracles, which may be found in Tillemont.⁴ What Eusebius relates of this kind, is:—1. That the ⁵ wild beasts could not be compelled to touch the Christians who were exposed to them; particularly the young martyr whose name is not recorded, and who was run through with a sword, and flung into the sea. He speaks as an eye-witness, and appeals to many then living for the truth of his narration.⁶ 2. That, when the martyr Apphianus was killed and cast into the sea, a violent tempest suddenly arose, which shook the whole city, and the waves cast his body back on the shore, of which all the inhabitants of Cæsarea were witnesses.⁷ *Amne jubet mergi puerum; scelus unda refugit.* 3. That the bodies of Pamphilus, and of other martyrs who died with him, being exposed to the birds and beasts four days and nights, remained untouched, the Divine Providence so ordering it, and were honourably interred by the Christians. That is, to use the words of Statius,

nec sontis iniqua tyranni

Jussa valent; durant habitus et membra cruentis

Inviolata feris, nudoque sub axe jacentes

Et nemus, et tristis volucrum reverentia servat.

The fact, we may suppose, is not to be denied; and, as Pamphilus was a most dear and intimate friend of Eusebius, it was natural for the historian to interpret it thus. This, and more than this, might be allowed to sacred friendship and virtuous affection. 4. That at Cæsarea, where the persecution raged,

¹ Euseb. E. H. viii. 8. ² There is little doubt that the story is a true one.—EDIT.

³ Video istic cruces non unus quidem generis, sed aliter ab aliis fabricatas. Alii capite conversos in terram suspendere, alii per obscœna stipitem egerunt, &c.—Seneca *Cons. ad Marc.* 20. ⁴ E. H. v.

⁵ Concerning this forbearance of the beasts, some remarks have been made at p. 202. It should not be dissembled that, from the accounts given us by Eusebius and others, it appears that some martyrs were assaulted and wounded by wild beasts, and others were not touched by them. ⁶ E. H. viii. 7.

⁷ De Mart. Pal. 4.

and the Christians lay up and down unburied, and the earth was strewed with their mangled limbs, though the day was bright and serene, the buildings ran down with drops, and the streets were wet with a sudden dew, as if the earth and the elements had wept at the sight of such barbarities. So said the Christians; and perhaps we should have said the same, if we had lived then, and had been in their distressed condition. "I doubt not," says Eusebius, "that this will be called fiction and trifle by some readers." But he adventured to record it, nor is there any reason why he should be scorned and insulted on that account; though probably there was nothing in it which did not arise from natural causes. Constantine seems to allude to the same thing in his Edict, speaking of the persecution: τὸ τηνικαῦτα ἐδάκρυε μὲν ἀναμφιβόλως ἡ γῆ· ὁ δὲ τὰ σύμπαντα περιέχων κόσμος τῷ λύθρῳ χραινόμενος ἀπεκλάετο· ἥ γε μὴν ἡμέρα αὐτῇ τῷ πένθει θαύματος ἐνεκαλύπτετο.⁸

Eusebius, in his narration of *Romanus*, mentions nothing miraculous;⁹ and yet Prudentius, Chrysostom, and Eusebius himself, in a discourse *de Resurrectione*, talk of many and signal miracles on the occasion:—as the fire being strangely extinguished in which he was to have been burnt, his speaking plainly after his tongue was cut out, though he had naturally an impediment in his speech and could not pronounce his own name. Valesius wonders that Eusebius should thus differ from himself: to which it may be replied that Eusebius the *orator* thought he might say what Eusebius the *historian* would not attest; and that his real sentiments must be learned from his history, and not from a sermon or a declamation. Tillemont is not quite fair, and silyly dissembles this silence of Eusebius.¹ But it is farther to be observed, that the *Opuscula* of Eusebius, in which is the discourse *de Resurrectione*, are extant only in Latin; and who knows what tricks the translator has played with them, and whether they be genuine or no? Eusebius is a name which belonged to more than threescore persons; and Cave is of opinion that these *Opuscula* were not written by the historian; and Tillemont himself is inclined, in another place, to give up this discourse.²

⁸ Euseb. *Vit. Const.* ii. 52.

⁹ E. H. v. 2.

¹ H. E. v. 206.

² H. E. vii. p. 63.

Rufinus, in his version of Eusebius, added, and left out, and altered, what he thought fit; and inserted a long account of the miracles of Gregory Thaumaturgus, of which Eusebius said not a word. The same insupportable licence he took in translating Origen; so that they are not versions, but *perversions* of the originals. However Rufinus is so far honest, as to own that he uses such liberties. Jerome was guilty of the same fault; and they had nothing to reproach one another with on that score.³

In this persecution Peter and Asclepius,—the former a member of the Church, the latter a Marcionite bishop,—were burnt. *Peter*, says Tillemont, *went to heaven, and Asclepius to hell-fire.*⁴ But Eusebius, more decently and moderately, says, *With Peter suffered Asclepius, through a zeal, as he thought, for piety, but not for that which is according to knowledge: however, they were consumed in one and the same fire.* Many of the Marcionites suffered martyrdom at different times. Why were these men put to death? Because they were heretics? No; but because they acknowledged Jesus to be the Son of God, and would not renounce him, and sacrifice to idols.⁵

10. We read in the *Alexandrian Chronicle*, in *Bollandus*, and in the *Menæa*, that *Gelasinus* (or *Gelasius*) and *Ardaleo*, two pantomimes, as they were drolling on the stage, and feigning themselves Christians, were suddenly converted, and suffered martyrdom; and other stories of the same kind are recorded.⁶ As to these two saints, *Gelasinus* and *Ardaleo*, (I suppose it should be *Ardelio*), their names, joined to their profession, make the account suspicious; the one being *Saint Harlequin*, and the other *Saint Jackanapes*: for it is not probable that these were names of men, though the one might act the part of a *Gelasinus*,

³ It is agreed that St. Jerome may be the greatest saint of all translators, but that he is not the most exact. He has taken liberties which the laws of translation will not admit, and his adversary, Rufinus, fails not to charge him with it.—Baillet, *Jug. des Savans*. Rufinus was excommunicated by Pope Anastasius, as an Origenist. He was not so good a scholar, but he might be as good a saint as Jerome, for anything that we know to the contrary.

⁴ Will men never be cured of the rash and malicious habit of always seeking in the corruption of the heart the origin of errors, which may be found more naturally and more innocently in the obscurity in which God has judged it proper to leave certain truths, and in the weakness of the human understanding?—Beausobre, *Hist. de Manich.* i. p. 28.

⁵ See Beausobre, *Hist. de Manich.* ii. 120.

⁶ See Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 418—421.

and the other of an *Ardelio*. *Gelasius* indeed is a name common enough.

11. In the time of Diocletian, there was a whole legion of Christians, called the *Theban Legion*, consisting of more than six thousand men, who suffered martyrdom by the orders of Maximian.⁷ This story has never wanted patrons, ancient and modern. It has been defended by Tillemont, by Hickes (who would have called any man *an atheist* for deriding it), and by many others. As it would not be fair to dissemble the evidence for it, let it be observed that it stands upon the authority of one Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, and a writer of the fifth century, who had it from the bishop of Geneva, who had it from Theodorus, another bishop, who had the honour and felicity to find the relics of these martyrs by *revelation*, and perhaps by the *smell* of the bones. Thus it terminates in a miracle; but *Nil agit exemplum litem quod lite resolvit*.

12. "About the time of Diocletian's persecution, or a little after, a council of the eastern churches was held at Seleucia, to reform the abuses which *Papas*, patriarch of Seleucia, had introduced into Ecclesiastical discipline; to examine many heavy accusations laid against him; and to hear the complaints of the bishops who were justly offended at his insolence. *Milles*, bishop of Susa, censured him for it with much freedom and gravity. 'Whence arises,' said he, 'this arrogance of yours, this contempt for your brethren the bishops, who have done nothing to merit such treatment? Do you then look upon the precepts of Jesus Christ as upon fables? Or know you not that he hath said, *Let him, who is chief among you, be as though he were the servant of others?*' 'Stupid animal,' replied *Papas*, 'it becomes thee truly to teach me what I know better than thou dost!' At these words, *Milles* took the Gospels out of his breast, and put the book upon a cushion, and addressing himself to *Papas*, said, 'If you are ashamed to learn your duty from me, who am but a mortal man, learn it at least from this Gospel, which you see plainly enough with the eyes of the body, but not with the eyes of the understanding.' Then *Papas*, like a man frantic and possessed, striking the sacred book with his hand, cried out, *Speak then, Gospel, speak*. *Milles*, hearing

⁷ Tillemont, H. E. iv. 421.

these profane words, took up the book ; and, turning himself to the people who were many in number, he put it to his mouth and to his eyes, and then raising his voice, ‘O proud man,’ said he to Papas, ‘the angel of the Lord will punish thy insult against the word of everlasting life. One half of thy body shall wither in a moment, that so sudden a punishment may be a conspicuous proof of the just severity of God against the proud and the profane. But thou shalt not die presently. God will continue thy life for some years, because he will make of thee an example for those who are like thee.’ On the instant Papas fell to the ground, and was struck with a palsy which took away the use of one side of his body ; and in this condition he lived twelve years, and then died. This happened A.D. 314.

“Such is the relation which the Syrians have given us of Papas, primate of the East. Our age has little faith for the *marvellous*, and chooses rather to ascribe such events to natural causes ; and indeed violent fits of anger ^s have sometimes brought on palsies. But it is not unsuitable to Divine Providence so to order second causes, that the punishment of a notorious sinner shall tread close upon his crime ; and that even the incredulous shall never be able to determine that there is nothing miraculous in it.”⁹

Milles, as Sozomen relates, was at first a soldier in the Persian army, embraced Christianity, and was made bishop of a city in Persia, where he was often cruelly used and beaten by the infidels. Finding that his labours amongst them were unsuccessful, and that he could not make one proselyte, he departed thence ; having pronounced a malediction on the city, which not long after was destroyed by the king, together with its inhabitants. Setting out as a pilgrim, and carrying with him nothing but the gospel, he went to visit Jerusalem ; thence he

^s The death of Nerva and Valentinian I. is ascribed to a violent fit of anger ; and to descend from emperors to lower persons, we read that a master of Trinity College in Cambridge scolded himself into a palsy : but these are no objections to the story here related, according to which the distemper was foretold by a good man, and inflicted upon a bad man ; and there is nothing in the account itself that should incline us to reject it.

⁹ Beausobre, *Hist. de Manich.* i. p. 184. Beausobre took this account from Asseman’s *Bibl. Orientalis*, and refers the reader to it.

travelled to Egypt, to see the monks ;¹ and returning home he suffered martyrdom, with many other Persian Christians, in the persecution under Sapor, about A.D. 340. He is said to have wrought miracles.²

XXV. OF THE CONVERSION OF CONSTANTINE.

WE are now coming to the age of Constantine, to the faint struggles of expiring Paganism, to Christianity by law established,³ and to a church blessed perhaps with prosperity and virtue : but it is hard for men to join these two together in stable alliance, which so many causes concur to keep asunder. From the age of Constantine the Divine Providence so ordered it, that Christianity was the reigning religion in the Roman Empire, under Christian Emperors, a small interval excepted in the reign of Julian ; and this seems to have been necessary for its support. In process of time it was so much altered and defaced, that, without the protection of the civil magistrate, it might have been in danger ; and Paganism, new-modelled and refined by philosophers, might have found too many advantages over it. Thus things went on from bad to worse, till the Reformation rescued the Gospel in some degree from the vile hands into which it was fallen. Such was the state of religion for many ages :—

Nihil aderat adjumenti ad pulchritudinem, ut, ni vis boni

In ipsa inesset forma, hæc formam extinguerent.

But Christianity, at the very worst, and under the greatest disadvantages, could not lose all her excellence, and undoubtedly produced good effects on thousands and ten thousands, whose lives are not recorded in Ecclesiastical History ; which, like other history, is for the most part a register of the vices, the follies, and the quarrels of those,⁴ who made a figure and a noise

¹ Perhaps, to see whether the great things, which fame reported concerning them, were true.

² This account Sozomen (E. H. ii. 14.) took from Syrian writers.

³ The completion of the prophecies, in the establishment of Christianity, and in the destruction of the persecuting princes, are subsequently considered.

⁴ Socrates, in the close of his work, observes that, if men were honest and peaceable, historians would be undone for want of materials.

in this world. The sacred writers foretold this fatal change and great apostacy, and thus the Divine Providence which brings good out of evil, caused the very corruption of Christianity to be one proof of its truth.

CONSTANTINE, A.D. 311, being disposed to protect and embrace Christianity, which his father had greatly favoured, and about to fight Maxentius, prayed to God for his assistance. As he was marching, he saw in the afternoon, in the sky, over the sun, a shining cross, with this inscription, ΤΟΥΤΩ ΝΙΚΑ, joined to it. The sight astonished him, and the army which accompanied him. This he related to Eusebius with his own mouth, and swore to the truth of it, at a time when many of the soldiers were living. Ἀμφὶ μεσημβρινὰς ἡλίου ὥρας, ἤδη τῆς ἡμέρας ἀποκλινούσης, αὐτοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδεῖν ἔφη ἐν αὐτῷ οὐρανῷ ὑπερκείμενον τοῦ ἡλίου σταυροῦ τρόπαιον ἐκ φωτὸς συνιστάμενον, γραφὴν τε αὐτῷ συνῆφθαι, λέγουσαν, Τούτῳ νίκα.⁵

Concerning this story there have been these opposite opinions:—1. That it was a miracle, wrought in favour of Constantine and of Christianity:—2. That it was a pious fraud, a mere stratagem of Constantine, to animate his soldiers, and to engage the Christians firmly on his side. Fabricius,⁶ as an *honorarius arbiter*, comes between both, and allows the fact, but rejects the miracle.⁷ “There is,” says he, “a natural appearance,

⁵ Euseb. *Vit. Const.* i. 28.

⁶ *Bibl. Gr.* vi. 1.

⁷ Perhaps there is nothing in the whole range of Christian history which has given rise to more discussion than the sincerity of Constantine's conversion, and the reality of the miracle to which it has been attributed. The former of these questions will be considered in the sequel. With respect to the latter, every claim to supernatural agency has long been relinquished, and the solution of Fabricius very generally adopted. The difficulty connected with the legend may very plausibly be removed by the supposition that it was embodied in the *dream*, wherein the excited imagination of Constantine dwelt upon the occurrences of the day; so that instead of deceiving Eusebius with a deliberate fiction, he may really have been impressed with the idea that he was presented in his sleep with a counterpart of his waking vision, and have ordered the celebrated standard to be inscribed accordingly. Against that part of the story, which attributes the formation of the banner to the injunction of Christ himself, the argument of Mosheim (*de Rebus ante Const.* p. 985) seems to be conclusive:—*Hæccine oratio servatoris humani generis, qui peccata hominum morte sua expiavit! Hæccine oratio illo digna est, qui pacis auctor mortalibus est, et suis hostibus ignoscere vult! Caveamus ne veterum Christianorum narrationibus de ætatis suæ miraculis acrius defendendis, in ipsam majestatem Dei et sanctissimam religionem, quæ non hostes, sed nos ipsos, debellare docet, injurii simus.* —EDIT.

a *Solar Halo*, which sometimes represents a lucid cross; and this is so rarely seen, that it is no wonder if Constantine, and they who beheld it with him, accounted it miraculous, especially at that juncture.

If this was no miracle, yet it tended to the service of Christianity, and to bring about the great revolution which then happened.

There are in historians, ancient and modern, and in the *Philosophical Transactions*, descriptions of such *phænomena*; and also of lucid circles, or crowns, accompanying them. Fabricius gives an account and a representation of some. Thus far all goes well enough: but the great difficulty is the inscription, ΤΟΥΤΩ ΝΙΚΑ, for which Fabricius offers this solution:—that ⁸ γραφή means a *picture* as well as a *writing*; and that λέγειν, when applied to a picture or image, means to *denote* or *imply*; and that the words of Constantine and Eusebius may be thus interpreted: *To the cross was adjoined a picture or image, intimating that by this he should conquer; which image was a lucid crown, a representation or symbol of victory.* To this I add that Eusebius, by not using the words στοιχεία or γράμματα, nor mentioning in what language it was written,⁹ seems to speak rather of an *emblem* or *picture*, than of a *writing*. Add to this, that, in the standard which Constantine ordered to be made in form of a cross, in memory of this omen, he placed a crown of gold and jewels on the top of it, and a cypher denoting the name of Christ; but not the words, ΤΟΥΤΩ ΝΙΚΑ.¹

Amongst the *Panegyrici Veteres*, the eighth is in praise of Constantine, and celebrates his victory over Maxentius, but

⁸ Eusebius uses γραφή for a *picture*, speaking of the cross, represented in a picture of Constantine. *Vit. Const.* iii. 3, 'Ο μὲν δὴ καὶ ἐν ΓΡΑΦΗΣ ὑψηλοτάτῳ πίνακι πρὸ τῶν βασιλικῶν προθύρων ἀνακειμένῳ, τοῖς πάντων ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁρᾶσθαι προὔτίθει, τὸ μὲν σωτήριον ὑπερκεῖμενον τῆς αὐτοῦ κεφαλῆς ΤΗ ΓΡΑΦΗ, παραδούς· τὸν δὲ ἐχθρὸν καὶ πολέμιον θῆρα, τὸν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῆς τῶν ἀθέων πολιορκήσαντα τυραννίδος, κατὰ βύθου φερόμενον ποιήσας ἐν δράκοντος μορφῇ.—Διὸ καὶ βασιλεὺς ὑπὸ τοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ ποσὶ, βέλει πεπαρμένον κατὰ μέσου τοῦ κύτους, βυθοῖς τε θαλάσσης ἀπερρέμενον, διὰ τῆς κηροχύτου ΓΡΑΦΗΣ ἐδείκνυ τοῖς πᾶσι τὸν δράκοντα· ὃν καὶ δυνάμει τοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἀνακειμένου σωτηρίου τροπαίου, κατὰ βυθῶν ἀπωλείας κεχωρηκέναι ἐδήλων.

⁹ Philostorgius (p. 478) supplies that defect, and says that it was in Latin: *In hoc vince*. But Philostorgius did not see it, and his testimony ought to go for nothing.

¹ Euseb. *Vit. Const.* i. 31.

says not a word of the cross. The author of this panegyric was a Pagan. The ninth also, composed by Nazarius, is silent concerning this prodigy. One of the panegyrists speaks of a bad omen, by which he might mean the cross.² But, after all, it seems rather more natural to interpret *γραφὴν λέγουσαν* of a *writing*, than a *picture*. It is an ugly circumstance, and I wish we could get fairly rid of it.

Licinius, if we may believe the writer *de Mortibus Persecutorum*,³ was instructed by an angel how to obtain the victory over Maximinus. This seems to have been a military stratagem of Licinius, to regain the favour of the Christians, and to animate his soldiers. It has been controverted, whether Licinius ever was a Christian. Cardinal Noris takes the negative, Pagi and Basnage the affirmative. The truth of the case seems to have been, that he pretended for some time to be a Christian, but never was so; and that, finding the Christians to be much more fond of Constantine than of himself, he threw off the mask.

XXVI. OF THE ORIGIN AND PROGRESS OF SAINT-WORSHIP, AND OTHER ROMISH CORRUPTIONS.

WHEN the Church under Constantine and his successors enjoyed the protection of the civil powers, the Christians compared their present with their past condition, and called to mind the sufferings of their predecessors, and the patience and fortitude which they had exerted, particularly in the last and severest persecution. These considerations raised in them a high, and indeed a just veneration for the martyrs; but it did not stop here; it ran into excess, and produced bad effects. Every rumour concerning the behaviour of those saints was received without due examination; the number of the sufferers was augmented; the sufferings of some of them were exaggerated; and many fictitious miracles were added to the account. Their bodies were discovered by the help of visions and revelations, and were said to emit perfumes, and to work miracles without end. This drew a great resort to their graves, and every one had his story to tell of the benefits which himself or

² Tillemont, *H. des Emp.* iv. 632, *not.*

³ *Cap.* xlv. p. 276.

⁴ See S. Basnage, *Ann.* ii. 667.

his neighbour had received. To have been suspicious or slow of belief on such occasions, would have passed for little better than atheism; and thus the frenzy grew epidemical. In the time of Augustine, many real or pretended monks went strolling about as hawkers and pedlars, selling the bones and relics of martyrs.⁵

The Fathers of those times, as Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, and who not, but particularly Chrysostom with his popular eloquence, contributed to the utmost of their power to encourage the superstitious veneration and invocation of saints, the love of monkery, and the belief of miracles wrought by monks and relics. Some of these Fathers, particularly Gregory, were in other respects valuable men; but this was the distemper of the age, and they were not free from it.⁶

Thence arose religious addresses to the martyrs, who were considered as patrons and intercessors; which tended to lessen the reliance and gratitude due to Christ, and to substitute new expedients in the room of rational piety and strict morality: and those Christians, who were conscious of their own defects, began to pay immoderate honours to the martyrs, that by their interest they might obtain remission of sins. Prudentius, who had a fine genius, and was a good poet for the time in which he flourished,—to atone, as he says, for the follies of his youth,—spent his latter days in defending the Catholic Faith, and in composing hymns to the martyrs; and expresses his hopes that Saint Romanus would do him a considerable service at the day of judgment, for the sake of a poem in which he had celebrated that martyr.

Vellem sinister inter Hædorum greges
Ut sum futurus, eminus dinoscerer,
Atque, hoc precante, diceret Rex optimus,
Romanus orat, transfer huc hædum mihi;
Sit dexter agnus; induatur vellere.⁷

These practices suited the half-converts and nominal Christians, who came over for the loaves, under Christian emperors. The gay and splendid appearance of the Church helped to allure them; they found new religious amusements to make up for

⁵ August. *de Op. Monach.* 28. See a dissertation of Mabillon, *de Cultu Sanctorum ignotorum*, in the *Act. Erud.* 1699, p. 107.

⁶ See Chrysostom, T. i. *Orat.* 40. p. 485. *Ed. Par.*

⁷ Prudent. *περὶ Στεφ.* 10.

those which they had quitted; and, if they were superstitious before, they might be so still, *mutatis mutandis*. In the room of gods and goddesses they had saints male and female, lord and lady protectors, to whom they might pay their respects; and instead of sleeping in their old temples, they could slumber over the bones of the martyrs, and receive as good information and assistance. If they longed for miracles, portents, prodigies, prophecies, visions, dreams, omens, divinations, amulets, charms, &c., they might be supplied.

Thus the Fathers of the fourth century in general introduced an irregular worship of the saints. I am sorry that I cannot entirely acquit Eusebius upon this head. He speaks thus in his *Præparatio*:—"Τῶν δὲ δὴ ἀποθανόντων ἐπὶ στρατείας, ἔφη Πλάτων), ὃς ἂν εὐδοκιμήσας τελευτήσῃ, ἂρ' οὐ πρῶτον μὲν φήσομεν τοῦ χρυσοῦ γένους εἶναι; Πᾶν γε μάλιστα. Ἀλλ' οὐ πεισόμεθα Ἡσιόδῳ, ἐπειδὴν τινες τοῦ τοιούτου γένους τελευτήσωσιν, ὥς ἄρα,

Οἱ μὲν δαίμονες ἄγνοϊ ἐπιχθόνιοι τελέθουσιν,

Ἐσθλοὶ, ἀλεξίκακοι, φύλακες μερόπων ἀνθρώπων;

Πεισόμεθα μὲν οὖν. Διαπυθόμενοι ἄρα τῷ Θεῷ, πῶς χρὴ τοὺς δαιμονίους τε καὶ θείους τιθέναι καὶ τίνι διαφόρῳ οὕτω καὶ ταύτη θήσομεν, ἢ ἂν ἐξηγῇται. Τί δ' οὐ μέλλομεν; Καὶ τὸν λοιπὸν δὴ χρόνον, ὥς δαίμονας γεγονότας, οὕτω θεραπεύσομέν τε, καὶ προσκυνήσομεν αὐτῶν τὰς θήκας. Τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ ταῦτα νομιοῦμεν, ὅταν τις γηρᾷ, ἢ τινι ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ τελευτήσῃ, τῶν ὅσοι ἂν διαφερόντως ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἀγαθοὶ κριθῶσι." Καὶ ταῦτα δὲ ἀρμόζει ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν θεοφιλῶν τελευτῇ, οὐδ' στρατιώτας τῆς ἀληθοῦς εὐσεβείας οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοις εἰπὼν, παραλαμβάνεσθαι, ὅθεν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς θήκας αὐτῶν ἔθος ἡμῖν παριέναι, καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς παρὰ ταύταις ποιεῖσθαι, τιμᾶν τε τὰς μακαρίας αὐτῶν ψυχὰς, ὥς εὐλόγως καὶ τούτων ὑφ' ἡμῶν γιγνομένων. This, though it contains no direct invocation of Saints, inclines too much towards it. Therefore Vigerus thought it worthy of a marginal note, and writes MARTYRUM CULTUS, lest the unattentive reader should pass it by. The argument stands thus:—Why should not we Christians show the same regard to our saints and martyrs, which the Pagans paid to their heroes? And the argument, together with the authority of Plato in this point, is good for nothing.⁸

⁸ Pr. Ev. xiii. 11.

⁹ "Montfaucon observes that Eusebius, in his Commentary on the Psalms

To observe a proper mean in the public respect due to departed saints, was a difficult point, and required more care and caution than the Fathers and Ecclesiastics of the fourth century thought fit to bestow upon it. Nothing seemed more reasonable than to celebrate suffering virtue, and to reverence those illustrious persons who had preferred duty to riches, honours, pleasures, and length of days. Gratitude, and dear affection, and friendship, and every commendable disposition pleaded for such a practice, and by it an holy emulation was kindled, and Christians were excited to imitate those whom they admired, and whom they saw thus honoured and praised. But the transition from lawful to unlawful veneration was easily made; and, as the Pagans from honouring their heroes soon began to deify them, it was easy to foresee that the Christians who were come over, or half over from Paganism, would behave themselves much in the same manner towards saints and martyrs, unless they were diligently restrained. And yet the Fathers, instead of guarding against this rising evil, gave it encouragement by their many indiscretions.

Hubertus Languetus, in one of his Epistles, observes that the day of the martyrdom of John Huss was kept at Prague with a solemnity approaching to superstition. *Ita autem celebratur ejus memoria, ut ea res aliquid superstitionis mihi habere videatur.* It may be so; but if a little enthusiasm and superstition is pardonable in any case, it is in paying honours to those worthies, who were massacred by cruel bigots and by nominal Christians, and who acted or suffered in defence of liberty, civil or religious; names far more venerable than one half of those which fill up the calendars and martyrologies. There is no great danger that Protestants should ever run into such excess, as to worship their heroes and martyrs.

(p. 486), testifies that the good actions of holy men, which he calls their merits, may be beneficial after their death to him who shall pray to God to show him mercy for their sakes. This may be admitted in some sense; for, after all, God may, if he thinks fit, show favour to a person for the memory of a saint; but as it is Jesus Christ who is the sole foundation of our redemption, and as he has ordered us to pray to God only in his name, it is much more safe to hold fast to that, and not to establish, from our own head, new forms of devotion, which were unknown in the Apostolical times, and which at last grew to an excess that was past all bearing."—(Le Clerc, *Bibl. A. et M.* iv. 16.)

Praying at the tombs of the martyrs, was one of the fooleries which the Fathers should have restrained. What an idea did it give, to weak Christians, of the Almighty, who ought to be worshipped in spirit and in truth; as if He could be supposed to show more favour to a petition, because it was offered up at the place where a good man lay buried?

As the honours paid to the dead and to the relics of the martyrs were set forward and supported, though not entirely, yet principally by the Consubstantialists, the Arians seem to have been rather less disposed to run into these puerilities. Faustus, the Manichæan, reproaches the Catholic Christians with their endless superstitions of this kind, and tells them that they were no better than humble imitators of Pagan Idolaters.

What the Pagans said of their Gods coming at certain times to visit their cities, the Christians afterwards said of their saints.¹ *Juturna Nympha, quæ juvaret. Itaque multi ægroti, propter id nomen, hinc aquam petere solent*; says Varro. For the same reason, women big with child sacrificed to Egeria, *quod eam putarent facile foetum alvo egerere*. So Festus. In like manner Christians have adored those saints, whose names resembled their diseases, their wants, their trades, &c.²

The sufferings of the martyrs had another effect upon persons of more zeal than prudence, and of a fervid and fanatical disposition. The times of martyrdom were over, and that sort of courage and constancy could not be exerted; and therefore pious people contrived a method of voluntary martyrdom, and inflicted upon themselves as many pains and penalties as Pagan cruelty had invented. They left parents, wives, children, friends, families, and fortunes; they retired from the world; they obliged themselves to a single and solitary life; they allowed themselves no more food, raiment, and sleep than would just keep body and soul together: and in these austerities, to do them justice, there was usually no dissimulation; all was performed in earnest. Several of them, as *Theodorus* and *Symeon Stylites*, when their mothers or sisters came to visit them, and earnestly begged admittance, would not be seen. When any of

¹ See Valesius on Euseb. p. 445, 6.

² See La Motthe Le Vayer, *Hexam. Rustique*, p. 136, &c., who banters these superstitions of those of his own communion.

them quitted their retirement and returned to the world, they were considered as apostates, and men lost to goodness; but they might enter into the church. At first they set at defiance all learning, as useless or pernicious, and imitated their father Antony, who was entirely illiterate. They spent their time in working with their hands, and in silence, prayer, and contemplation: but afterwards, when they were formed into societies, they betook themselves to study. They dwelt apart, each in his hole, so that most of them kept sad company; and, by this moping and ever-musing life, they were prepared and qualified to dream dreams and see visions, and to converse with angels and dæmons; and many miracles were said to be wrought by them, which found easy credit and reception in a credulous age.

The devils used often to appear to the monks in the figure of Ethiopian boys or men, and thence probably the painters learned to make the devil black.

Evagrius, an adorer of monkery, has given us a strange account of the Monks of Palestine in the fifth century. Some, says he, shut up in monasteries, exercise all sorts of macerations; some dwell in little dens of the earth just big enough to hold them; others of a more eminent degree, males and females, repair to desert places, wearing nothing except a small covering of their nakedness, and, walking upon all-four, eat grass and roots like the beasts; and if they see any passenger, they run away and hide themselves. Another sort of Monks, more perfect than all the former, haunt the cities and the places of the greatest resort, *pretending to be mad*; and run into public-houses,³ and eat and drink with any sort of people; and frequent the baths continually; and, above all, seek out the company of the women who go there, and wash themselves along with them; &c. *Balnea publica frequenter adeunt, et simul cum mulieribus diversantur et lavant. Adeo omni perturbatione animi superiores, ut naturæ ipsi vim inferant, et nec aspectu, nec tactu, nec amplexu ipso mulieris, ad ea quæ naturæ ipsorum propria sunt, inclinari queant. Sed cum viris quidem viri sunt, feminae vero cum feminis. Non enim unius, sed utriusque simul sexus esse cupiunt.*⁴ You may think perhaps that Evagrius intended to insult or ridicule them. 'Tis no such thing; he is very serious.

³ Into brothel-houses, says Nicephorus.

⁴ Evagr. E. H. i. 21.

Gregory Nazianzen, celebrating the absurd austerities and mortifications of the monks of Nazianzum, tells us that some of them, through an excess of zeal, killed themselves, to be released from the wicked world.⁵

Pachomius the Monk earnestly exhorted his disciples to discover without delay their temptations to the wisest of their brethren, by whom they might be instructed how to get the victory over them; lest, by concealing them too long, they should be carried to horrible extremities: for he assured them that many upon that account had flung themselves from the rocks, had cut open their bellies, and had killed themselves in various ways.⁶ Nothing is more probable than that such a course of life should produce melancholy madness. Some of the philosophers had exercised strange severities upon themselves and upon their disciples, from the days of Pythagoras down to the time of Lucian, who introduces the philosopher Nigrinus as condemning such practices, and observing that they had occasioned the death of several persons.⁷ They who had not the resolution to join themselves with these monks, yet admired what they would not imitate, *and all the people magnified them.*

Monkery was pretty well established in the time of Constantine. It began in the Eastern countries, in Egypt, Palestine, and Persia, before it was introduced into the western parts of the Roman Empire.

“*Palladius* was a friend of Rufinus and of St. Chrysostom, a defender of Origen, a favourer of Pelagius, and an adversary of Saint Jerome. His history of the Monks, and of their miracles, contains, like most other accounts of this kind, many extraordinary things. Amongst several instances of solid virtue and useful reflections, we find in it childish observations, examples which it would be dangerous to imitate, extravagant austerities, unreasonable actions, and injudicious enterprises.”⁸ Palladius was a bishop, and had been a monk himself. He

⁵ Greg. Naz. p. 107.

⁶ Tillemont, H. E. vii. 199.

⁷ Lucian. vol. i. p. 67. Hemsterhusius says ad loc. :—Christiani Ascetæ, postquam vestitum veterum philosophorum adsciverant, hæc quoque, quæ Lucianus merito deridet, præpostera formandæ pietatis instrumenta non spreverunt; quo de genere non pauca reperies in vitis Patrum, et Cassiani Institutionibus. Multa notant, sed admodum perturbate, Cresol. Th. Rhet. v. 6, 7. Boilav. Hist. Flag. c. iv. p. 78.

⁸ Du Pin.

wrote the lives of the monks down to his own time (A. D. 420). His book is called *Historia Lausiaca*:—a work, says Fabricius, *quod nemo leget sine summa admiratione studii incredibilis quo viri illi et feminæ tam enixe conati sunt austeritate vitæ celibis et solitariæ, cultu durissimo, inedia ac jejuniis vix humanis, et abstinentia ab omnibus commodis vitæ, assequi sanctimoniam. Quamquam hanc in longe aliis rebus consistere, aliis peti aliquæ, neque in solitudines esse relegandam, et cum conjugio et societate hominum neutiquam pugnare, tum sacræ literæ tum ratio sana et sanctorum hominum non solitariorum conjugumque exempla, et Monachorum atque Eremitarum peccata, testantur.*⁹

The Greek philosophers had a particular dress, and affected to appear rough, mean, and dirty, for which they were sometimes insulted in the streets by boys and by the populace; and the *Cynics*, very prudently, were armed with a staff, to defend themselves from dogs and from the rabble. The Christian monks imitated the old philosophers in their garb and appearance, and many of them seemed, in the opinion of those who loved them not, to have inherited the rags, the pride, and the contentious spirit of the former. Some of them, out of mortification, would not catch or kill the vermin which devoured them, in which they far surpassed the Jews, who only spared them upon the Sabbath day. *Qui pediculum Sabbato necat, tam reus est, quam qui camelum Sabbato necaret*: says a Rabbi.

Ammon, the father of the Egyptian monks, in the days of his youth, being importuned by his relations to take a wife, married a young virgin; and on the wedding evening entertained her with a long harangue against the married state, and made her as fanatical as himself. The conclusion of which was that they both eloped from their house, and fled to the desert, and there led a monastic life.¹ We may compare this with the metamorphosis of Hippomenes and Atalanta, who on their wedding day were turned into lions:—

—— modo levæ fulvæ

Colla jubæ velant: digiti curvantur in ungues:

Ex humeris armi fiunt: in pectora totum

Pondus abit: summæ cauda verruntur arenæ.

Iram vultus habet; pro verbis murmura reddunt:

Pro thalamis celebrant silvas.²

⁹ Fabric. Bibl. Gr. ix. 5.

¹ Socrat. E. H. iv. 23.

² Ovid. *Met.* x.

However, the monks, even in the earliest times, were not all of them such wonderful examples of mortification, as we learn from an unexceptionable witness, who was a fast friend and patron of monkery;—from Athanasius. Writing to Dracontius, a monk, who had been chosen a bishop, and wanted much to decline the office, he says: *When you are a bishop, you may fast and drink no wine: for we have known bishops who were fasters, and monks who were eaters; bishops who abstained from wine, and monks who drank it; bishops who wrought miracles, and monks who wrought none. Many of the bishops have kept themselves even from matrimony, and monks have been the fathers of children.*³ Tillemont, when he gives an account of this epistle, omits the passage we have cited; and Du Pin, in his *Bibliothèque*, has inserted it. Each had his reasons.

Jerome exhorts *Rusticus*, a monk, to live in a monastery, rather than to be an hermit in a solitary place. He sets forth the inconveniencies and bad consequences of this way of life. “An hermit,” says he, “becomes proud, thinks himself a man of importance, forgets what he is, eats what he will, sleeps as much as he thinks fit, stands in awe of no person, is oftener rambling in the streets than at home in his cell. Not that I blame a solitary life, but I would have men first learn their spiritual exercises in a monastery.”⁴

Constantine held in the highest veneration those who addicted themselves to *divine philology*, as it was called in those days; that is, to monkery; and the holy women who preserved a perpetual virginity, these he almost adored. So says Eusebius, who

³ Athanas. Epist. ad Dracont.

⁴ See Du Pin. They who have judged monasteries to be hurtful or useless, yet ever approved of universities, colleges, halls, schools, public libraries, hospitals, and places set apart for the relief of the miserable, the encouragement of literature, and the education of youth. Our Chelsea College, as they say, was designed by King James I. for *polemic divines*; and then, with a very small and easy alteration, it was made a receptacle of *maimed and disabled soldiers*. If the King's project had been put in execution, the house would probably have been a house of discord; and *Peace be within thy walls*, would have been a fruitless wish and a prayer bestowed in vain upon it.—*Eo primum fine fundatum fuit (hoc Collegium) a Jacobo primo, ut illic Theologi alerentur, quorum officium esset, ut publice oppugnarent novas in Ecclesia hæreses.* (Act. Erudit., 1709, p. 114.) The *Baleares*, to teach their children the use of the sling, hung up their dinner, and did not let them eat it till they had fetched it down with a stone. In like manner, the fellows of this college were not to have been admitted to commons, till they had discovered a new heresy in the writings of some contemporary, and had confuted the doctrine and worried the author.

was carried away himself with the torrent, and overvalued this strange way of life.⁵ To some of these saints might have been applied what Tertullian says of the Roman god, *Faunus Fatuus* :—*Curari eum magis quam consecrari decebat*.

But of all the praisers of virginity, Jerome seems to have performed his part the best, who calls Eustochium, the nun, *his lady*, because she was the *spouse* of his *lord*; and reminds the mother of this lady, that she had the honour to be *God's mother-in-law* (*Socrus Dei*).⁶

After all, since some of the ancient monks seem to have been pious, honest, well-meaning and sensible men, a doubt will arise whether the writers of their lives have not sometimes misrepresented them, as using more rigour and self-maceration than they really exercised; and whether they have not ascribed to them some freaks and follies into which they never fell, as well as miracles which they never performed. The sayings and the actions of these solitary saints,—collected by Tillemont, Fleury, and others, and inserted in various parts of their ecclesiastical histories,—are sometimes noble and commendable, charitable, discreet, compassionate, and good-natured; but oftener trifling, frantic, absurd, and ridiculous, mixed with everlasting apparitions of devils, and with miracles of the most useless, fantastic, and improbable kind. So the whole is a strange medley of piety and folly, sense and nonsense.

Concerning the miracles wrought in the fourth and fifth centuries, this general observation may be made;—that they were usually performed, either to serve the cause of the Consubstantialists and to run down Arianism, as afterwards Nestorianism and Pelagianism; or to establish the adoration of saints and of relics; or to represent a monastic life as the summit of human piety, the quintessence of perfection, and a service the most acceptable to heaven. One would wonder how the physicians did to live in those days, when this effusion of miracles seemed to have rendered their art altogether unnecessary. They could have had no business, except amongst Pagans, Jews, heretics, and schismatics.⁷

The Egyptian monks, says Sozomen, preserved with great

⁵ Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 26, 28. Demonstr. Ev. i. 8, 9; iii. p. 129.

⁶ Epist. ad Eustoch. T. iv. P. 2, pp. 27 et 36.

⁷ Is this one of Jortin's flippancies, or a bit of good sound sense?—EDIT.

care the memory of the wonders wrought by their founders and forefathers; but they thought it proper to deliver them down from one to another by word of mouth, not by written records. Perhaps they were driven to this method by necessity, and because they could neither write nor read. As a story never loses in telling, the wonders were daily augmented by this excellent contrivance; and the traditionary snow-ball, rolled about by the monks, licked up new materials, and made a considerable figure. Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ θεσπέσια ἐπ' αὐτῷ συμβέβηκεν, ἃ μάλιστα τοῖς κατ' Αἴγυπτον μοναχοῖς ἠκρίβωται, — περὶ πολλοῦ ποιουμένοις διαδοχῇ παραδόσεως ΑΓΡΑΦΟΥ ἐπιμελῶς ἀπομνημονεύειν τὰς τῶν παλαιότερων Ἀσκητῶν ἀρετάς.⁸ The Egyptians were by nature disposed to bear austerities and mortifications, and fit to become monks. Amm. Marcell. xxii. 16, *Homines autem Ægyptii plerique subfusculi sunt et atrati, gracilenti et aridi, ad singulos motus excandescetes, controversi et reposcenes acerrimi. Erubescit apud eos, si quis non inficiando tributa plurimas in corpore vibices ostendat. Et nulla tormentorum vis inveniri adhuc potuit, quæ obdurato illius tractus latroni invito elicere potuit, ut nomen proprium dicat.* Ælian Var. Hist. vii. 18, Αἰγυπτίους φασὶ δεινῶς ἐγκαρτερεῖν ταῖς βασάνοις, καὶ ὅτι θάπτον τεθνήσκειται ἀνὴρ Αἰγύπτιος στρεβλούμενος ἢ τ' ἀληθὲς ὁμολογήσει.

The Emperor Valens made a law to compel the monks to serve civil offices, and, as some say, to serve in the army, which was no bad scheme.⁹ Many of these monks, as it appears from ecclesiastical history, had such a martial spirit, and were so addicted to fighting, that they were fitter for the camp than for the cloister. But it is not probable that Valens would have done the Egyptian monks so much honour as to list them for soldiers; or that they had the legal qualifications requisite for it. He compelled them *militare*, as Orosius and others say; but in those days the words *militia* and *militare* were used for all kind of public offices, *civil* as well as *military*.

⁸ Sozom. E. H. i. 14.

⁹ Cod. Theod. l. xii. Tit. i. p. 409: "Quidam ignaviae sectatores, desertis civitatum muneribus, captant solitudines ac secreta, et specie religionis cum coetibus Monazontôn congregantur. Hos igitur atque hujusmodi, intra Ægyptum deprehensos, per comitem Orientis erui e latebris consultâ præceptione mandavimus, atque ad munia patriarum subeunda revocari." The same law is to be found in Justinian's Code. See Gothofred's notes; and Tillemont, H. E. viii. 608, 808.

In the fourth century, the number of the monks and nuns of Egypt alone amounted to more than *ninety-six thousand*.¹ One reason of this multiplication of monks was that they were a collection of all sorts of people; of beggars, fugitives, vagabonds, slaves, day-labourers, peasants, mechanics of the lowest sort, thieves and highwaymen, inured to stripes, poverty, hunger, and hardships; so that a monastic life, such as it was, was preferable to that which they had led, and by becoming monks, they became gentlemen, and a sort of saints. We find from Augustin, that several of them refused to labour with their hands, and expected to be maintained in laziness; pretending that the good instruction which they imparted, and the good example which they set, deserved such a recompence, for which this Father reprimands them.²

The monks in all times had their friends and their foes; the first were generally of the clergy, and the second of the laity. In the fourth century, the people of Rome for the most part, as we learn from Jerome, abhorred the monks, who repaired thither from the east, as beggarly impostors, and hungry Greeks, who seduced ladies of fortune and quality, and often ruined their health by persuading them to practise rigid mortifications and austerities.

When Jerome departed from Rome (A.D. 385), Paula, with her daughter Eustochium, followed him. She was an illustrious lady, of the family of the *Gracchi* and the *Cornelii*. Before she set out, she divided her effects amongst her children; and then went to the haven, accompanied by her young, afflicted, weeping family, her brother, her children, and her kindred. *Parvus Toxotius*, says Jerome, *supplices manus tendebat in litore. Rufina jam nubilis, ut suas expectaret nuptias, tacitis fletibus obsecrabat*. But Paula, like another ³ *Regulus*, brake through all these dear obstacles. She went to Cyprus, to kiss the feet of Epiphanius; thence to Antioch to visit Paulinus; and thence I know not whither. What a folly for a grave matron to leave her family,

¹ Fleury, H. E. v. p. 30.

² August. Retract. ii. c. 21.

³ Hor. Carm. III. 5. 41.—Fertur pudicæ conjugis osculum,

Parvosque natos, ut capitis minor,

Ab se removisse, et virilem

Torvus humi posuisse vultum.

out of devotion; and, transformed into a religious gipsy, to roam about by sea and land from place to place, to visit monks and ecclesiastics! And what a still greater indiscretion in Jerome, to countenance and encourage such things! The laics in those days had just cause to dislike the monks, who put such superstitious fancies into the heads of their mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters, and taught them to throw away their time and their money too; for these travelling ladies used to carry alms and oblations with them, to be distributed as the directors of their conscience should advise. Homer was a much better preacher upon this subject, than the Fathers of the fourth and following centuries:—

Ἄλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα τὰ σαυτῆς ἔργα κόμιζε,
Ἰστόν τ' ἡλακάτην τε, καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι κέλευε
Ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι.⁴

Melania, the younger, had the same kind of zeal, and was much admired for it. “Piniano juncta erat, juveni nobilissimo, quem duorum filiorum patrem fecerat. *Tantum eam cœpit odium matrimonii, ut dixerit marito suo Piniano, filio Severi, qui erat ex præfectis, ‘Si volueris quidem habitare mecum ut ratio dictat, te dominum agnosco: sin autem hoc tibi grave videtur, utpote juveni, res omnes meas tibi habe, et solum sine me esse corpore liberam.’ Deus postea misertus adolescentis, ei zelum pietatis immisit. Cum ergo nupsisset viro, tredecim annos nata, septem vero cum eo vixisset, vigesimo ætatis suæ anno mundo renunciat.*”⁵ Omnia sua Serica integumenta dedit altaribus, parteque prædiorum longe maximâ distractâ, collectam pecuniam in Palæstinam, Egyptum, aliasque regiones pauperibus Monachisque distribuendam misit.⁶ This was A.D. 408.

Ambrose was one of the violent declaimers in favour of virginity; and, in a treatise on that subject, he exhorts girls to enter into nunneries, though against the will of their parents, which was highly indiscreet, to say no more; and which gave great offence to many Christians, even in those days.⁷

⁴ Il. Z. 490.—No more—but hasten to thy tasks at home,
There guide the spindle, and direct the loom.

⁵ Pallad. Laus.

⁶ S. Basnage, *Ann.* iii. 228.

⁷ Ambrose *de Virgin.* See Barbeyrac. Du Pin, T. ii. p. 246.

[Jortin's remarks on *Monkery* are very *à propos* with respect to certain current

XXVII. OF THE DONATISTS.

CONSTANTINE had a great desire to accomplish two very laudable designs:—the first was to propagate Christianity and to convert unbelievers; the other was to reunite Christians, and to compose their differences. In the first attempt he succeeded in some measure; but, along with those who were sincere in their profession, there came a multitude of hypocrites and nominal Christians. The latter project he soon found to be impracticable.

In the persecution A.D. 303, Christians were required to give up their sacred books. They who complied, were called *Traditores*. *Mensurius*, Bishop of Carthage, was suspected of this fault; for which, and for other reasons, *Donatus* and his partisans refused to hold communion with him; and thus began the schism of the *Donatists*,⁸ which continued three hundred years, and overspread the provinces of Africa. Constantine took fruitless pains to settle this affair by councils and hearings; and, finding the Donatists extremely refractory, he was provoked to use rough methods, and to banish their ringleaders; but afterwards he recalled them,

schemes for the establishment of *Protestant* convents. *Protestant*, forsooth! Even the last paragraph has lately found a fearful parallel. *Cavete, Cavete!!*—EDIT.]

⁸ There is an inaccuracy in Jortin's account of the *Donatists*. It was *after the death* of *Mensurius* (A. D. 311) that the see of Carthage had been filled up by an appointment, to which the customary consent of the Bishop of Numidia had not been solicited. One Felix, who had taken a prominent part in the transaction, was the *traditor*, accused of having delivered up copies of the Scriptures in the Dioclesian persecution; Donatus and his partisans condemned the election in a council of their own; and Constantine endeavoured, by the most decided measures, to put an end to the schism. Both in this, and other measures in defence of Catholicity, he signally failed; at the end of the fourth century four hundred Donatist bishops presided over a large proportion of the African Church; and it remained for the pen of Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, to expose and destroy the faction. A *faction* indeed it was, rather than either a schism or a heresy; for they were never convicted of any error either in doctrine or discipline; but in rejecting the control of the African church, they pushed their animosity far beyond the bounds of justice and Christian moderation. They are accused, indeed, of a fearful propensity to suicide; which may perhaps be accounted for, though it can never be justified, by the fearful persecutions of which they were the victims. Augustin. Epist. ad Bonifac. c. 3, *Quidam etiam se trucidandos armatis viatoribus ingerebant, percussuros eos se, nisi ab iis perimerentur, terribiliter comminantes. Nonnunquam et ab judicibus transeuntibus extorquebant violenter, ut a carnificibus vel ab officio ferirentur. Jam vero per abrupta præcipitia, per aquas et flammæ, occidere seipsos quotidianus illis ludus fuit.* See Mosheim, E. H. Cent. iv. 2, 3; v. 2, 5. Fleury, E. H. x. 11; xv. 32.—EDIT.

and gave them up, as he said, like incorrigible fools, to their own madness. Those schismatics, who wrangle in good earnest about trifles, have an incurable understanding, and are unpersuadeable ; and would fall out with themselves, if they had none else to oppose.

XXVIII. OF THE ARIANS.

ABOUT the same time brake out the Arian controversy,⁹ which made more noise, and did more mischief. It was the occasion

⁹ The Arian schism will ever claim a degree of importance above every other system of heterodoxy which either preceded or followed it. From the nature of Jortin's remarks, his account of it is necessarily both concise and discursive ; and it may, therefore, be as well to observe that the authorities upon which it rests, and to which the student is referred for the prosecution of his inquiries, are,—*Eusebius* in his *Life of Constantine*, *Athanasius*, *Hilary*, *Basil*, *Epiphanius*, *Theodoret*, and the ecclesiastical histories of *Sozomen* and *Socrates*, together with the fragments of *Philostorgius*, preserved by *Photius*. Newman's "History of Arianism" is the work which he will make his text-book ; and it neither is, nor was likely to be, infected by the opinions, which have been more recently, and most unhappily, imbibed by the author. Among the causes which tended to the temporary extinction of the heresy after the Nicene decree, the divisions amongst the members of the sect were not the least influential. The different modifications of their creed were exceedingly numerous. Those who conformed to the genuine tenets of their founder denied altogether the *consubstantiality* of the Father and the Son, and maintained that their essences were totally distinct and dissimilar. Hence they were called *Anomæans* ; and, from one of their most eminent teachers, *Eunomians*. Between these and the *Semi-Arians*, called also *Eusebians*, after Eusebius of Nicomedia, the distinction seems to have been rather *nominal* than *real*. They communicated with the Arians ; and although they admitted the *perfect likeness* of the Father and Son, for the sake of eluding the decree of the Council of Nice, they equally denied their *consubstantiality*. From this peculiarity, which seems at least to have originated in intrigue, they were denominated *Homoiousians*, in opposition to the *Homoousians*, or Catholics. There were also several subdivisions of this branch ; for instance, the *Douliaus*, who maintained that the Son was the *servant* of the Father. The sect also included the *Aetians*, *Psathyrians*, *Pneumatomachians* (a synonym of the *Macedonians*), and various other offshoots, which it is needless to particularise.

On the accession of Theodosius the Great to the imperial dignity, he declared himself unequivocally in favour of the orthodox creed ; and asserted his resolution to sanction no other religion within his dominions, than that which acknowledged the essential unity of the Son with the Father and the Holy Ghost. In accordance with his views, the second Œcumenical Council was summoned at Constantinople (A. D. 381), at which 150 bishops were present. They confirmed the decision of the Council of Nice, and further condemned the Macedonian heresy, which impugned the divinity and distinct personality of the Holy Spirit. From this period Arianism dwindled into complete insignificance ; and at the close of the fourth century, with the exception of a few individuals, who privately professed its forsaken creed, it had totally disappeared throughout the whole extent of the Roman empire. It survived till a somewhat later period beyond its limits, and Bede

of innumerable lies, slanders, forgeries, pretended miracles, persecutions, banishments, seditions, and murders; of many false and partial histories; and of a multitude of councils which produced only confusion and discord. "An evil dæmon," says Eusebius, "who envied the peace and prosperity of the church, set us at variance."

At sæva e speculis tempus Dea nacta nocendi
 Ardua tecta petit stabuli; et de culmine summo
Pastorale canit signum, cornuque recurvo
 Tartaream intendit vocem: qua protenus omne
 Contremuit nemus, et silvæ intonuere profundæ.
 Audiit et Triviæ longe lacus, audiit amnis
 Sulfurea Nar albus aqua, fontesque Velini:
 Et trepidæ matres pressere ad pectora natos.¹

Here also Constantine laboured in vain to bring things to an accommodation; but the most probable way to effect it was not put in execution.

Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, and Arius who was a Presbyter in his diocese, disputed together about the nature of Christ;² and the bishop being displeased at the notions of Arius,

(E. H. 18.) seems to intimate that it had slightly infected the Anglo-Saxon churches. Although both Grotius and Erasmus have been accused of favouring its tenets, the latter at least has expressly disavowed the charge. *Nulla hæresis*, he observes, *magis extincta est quam Arianorum.*

At length, however, in the latter part of the seventeenth century, the doctrines of Arius were revived by several foreign writers, and eventually imported into England. In reply to these and other cognate deviations from the orthodox creed, Bishop Bull wrote his two great works,—the *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, and the *Primitiva et Apostolica Traditio*; wherein, by an accurate investigation of the belief of the primitive church down to the decision of the *Council of Nice*, he proved that it had ever been based upon the teaching of the apostles and their successors. His complete success was acknowledged by the most eminent divines, both at home and abroad; and his labours will ever furnish an invaluable defence of the catholic doctrine of the *Trinity in unity*. The controversy, however, was not extinguished. In the year 1708, shortly after the death of Bishop Bull, Mr. William Whiston, the successor of Newton in the mathematical chair at Cambridge, and the translator of Josephus, stood forth as the avowed champion of the Arian heresy. To follow out the history of modern Arianism would here be impossible; but it may be useful to enumerate the principal sources of information on the subject. They are Whiston's *Memoirs*, written by himself; Clarke's *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*; Price's *Sermons*; *Letters* of Price and Priestley; Carpenter's *Lectures*; Ben Mordecai's *Letters*; Waterland's *Works*; Whittaker's *Origin of Arianism*; and Jortin's *Progress of Arianism in England*.—EDIT.

¹ Virg. *Æn.* vii. 511.

² Si ulla pars est theologiæ, in qua facile est aut errare aut accusari, est illa de Trinitate.—Grotius.

and finding that they were adopted by other persons, *was very angry*, says Socrates :—*πρὸς ὀργὴν ἐξάπτεται*. He commanded Arius to come over to his sentiments, and to quit his own :³ as if a man could change his opinions as easily as he can change his coat ! He then called a council of war, consisting of near an hundred bishops, and deposed, excommunicated, and anathematised Arius ; and, with him, several ecclesiastics, two of whom were bishops.⁴

Ille dies primus leti primusque malorum
Causa fuit.

Alexander then wrote a circular letter to all bishops ; in which he represents Arius and his partisans as heretics, apostates, blasphemers, enemies of God, full of impudence and impiety, forerunners of Antichrist, imitators of Judas, and men whom it was not lawful to salute, or to bid God speed. Yet Sozomen acknowledges that they were learned men, and, in all appearance, good men.⁵

There is no reason to doubt of the probity and sincerity of those who opposed Alexander and the Nicene Fathers ; for what did they get by it, besides obloquy and banishment ? Many good men were engaged on both sides of the controversy. So it was in the fourth century, and so it has been ever since. In the same epistle, Alexander is very severe upon Eusebius of Nicomedia, who afterwards was the head of the Arian party.

³ Soz.—Τὸν Ἀρειὸν ὁμοίως φρονεῖν ἐκέλευσε.

⁴ The Benedictine editors of Athanasius tell us that Alexander was as mild as a lamb, *vir mitis et pacis amans*. Others will think, perhaps, that he and his assessors were too expeditious in passing sentence, and ready to turn a brother out of doors without much ceremony.

*Collige sarcinulas, exclamat Præsul, et exi
Ocius, et propera.*

⁵ *Cum igitur Alexander multos sanctioris vitæ specie venerabiles, et dicendi arte pollentes, Arianis favere animadverteret, ac præcipue Eusebium, qui tunc temporis Nicomediensem Ecclesiam gubernabat, virum doctissimum, magnæque in palatio auctoritatis, cunctis ubique episcopis scripsit, ne cum illis communicarent.*—Soz. i. 15.—*At vero Eusebius, et alii quidam Orientalium partium episcopi, qui tum doctrinæ tum sanctitatis causa, per id tempus celeberrimi habebantur, &c.*—Idem. iii. 18. Theodoret himself says of Basilus Ancyranus and Eustathius Sebastenus, who were Semiarian bishops :—*Porro ambo familiares erant Imperatori (Constantio), et ob excimiam vitæ sanctimoniam summa apud eum auctoritate et fiducia pollebant.*—ii. 25.

In defence of the *divinity* and *eternity* of the Son, he uses arguments which are not all of them conclusive; and brings texts of Scripture, of which some are, and others are not, to the purpose.⁶ He declares that the Son is *from all eternity, immutable, and perfectly like the Father in all things*: excepting that he is not *unbegotten, or self-existing*; that upon this account the Father is *greater than the Son*; and that the Son is of a *middle nature* between the first cause of all things, and the creatures which from a state of non-existence were called into being.⁷

The difference between Alexander and the *Semiarians* seems not to have been great. Yet Pachomius, the monk, had a revelation, and a voice from heaven, which directed him to follow the doctrine of Alexander. *Such was the testimony which God gave to the pure and orthodox faith of this holy prelate, who was soon to be attacked by the calumnies of the Arians.*⁸ If this be true, a man may be orthodox, without coming fully up to that standard of orthodoxy which was fixed in later ages. Monsieur Jurieu, whose zeal against heresy is well known, assures us that the fundamental articles of Christianity were not understood by the Fathers of the three first centuries; that the true system began to be modelled into some shape by the Nicene bishops, and was afterwards immensely improved and beautified by the following Synods and councils; that is, by the *Jurieus* of the fourth and fifth centuries. Thus did this warm and imprudent writer make concessions as large and liberal as his adversaries

⁶ To prove the eternity of the Λόγος, he cites *Psalm* xlv. 1. *My heart is enditing a good matter.* (In the Greek, Ἐξερεύξατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν.) To this he adds another proof, which shows that he was a passable cabalist. *Solomon*, says he, declares (*Prov.* xxx. 19.) that it is impossible to find out the way of a serpent upon a rock; which rock, as *St. Paul* tells us, is *Christ*. How hardened and perverse must those men have been, who could withstand such evidence!

⁷ Μόνω τῷ ἀγεννήτῳ λειπόμενον ἐκείνου—ὡς αὐτὸς ἐπαίδευσεν ὁ Κύριος, Ὁ Πατήρ μου, λέγων, μείζων μου ἐστίν. And again: μακρὸν ἂν εἴη μεταξύ Πατρὸς ἀγεννήτου καὶ τῶν κτισθέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων,—ὧν μεσιτεύουσα ΦΥΣΙΣ μονογενὴς, δι' ἧς τὰ ὅλα ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐποίησεν ὁ Πατήρ τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγος, ἡ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντος Πατρὸς γεγέννηται. *Apud Theodoret.* i. p. 17. *Benigne intelligendum est quod ait Alexander, says Valesius.* It is very well observed; for without *benignity* and *grains of allowance*, Alexander himself will not be much better than the *Semi-Arians*. *Sed vos, Trojugenæ, vobis ignoscitis.*—Therefore Valesius, and several besides him, interpret the words of Alexander, so as to express their own *scholastic* language, and say that φύσις means *personality*, considered abstractedly from *entity*. See *Le Clerc, Art. Crit.* vol. i. p. 293, &c.

⁸ Tillemont, H. E. vi. 216.

could desire, and deliver himself up to be buffeted by the Socinians, whom he had treated as the vilest of all heretics.

Philostorgius says that one *Alexander Baucalis* was the incendiary, who stirred up the unhappy quarrel between Alexander and Arius. He also tells us that Alexander of Alexandria owed his bishoprick to Arius, who might have been chosen, but declined it, and preferred Alexander to himself. He also mentions some things which are not to the honour of Athanasius. Philostorgius, indeed, was an Arian; but there is no good reason why we should follow the example of modern ecclesiastical historians, and believe everything that the *Homoousians* say concerning the Arians, and nothing that the Arians say concerning the Homoousians. It is best to be diffident, and not to trust overmuch to the relations of either party.

Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Eusebius the historian, endeavoured to pacify Alexander, and to persuade him to make up the quarrel; and Constantine sent a letter by the illustrious Hosius of Corduba, to Alexander and Arius, in which he reprimanded them both for disturbing the church with their insignificant disputes *ὑπὲρ μικρῶν καὶ λίαν ἐλαχίστων*, and exhorted them to mutual forbearance and forgiveness. Socrates commends this letter, and calls the emperor's sentiments wise and prudent. *Τοιαῦτα μὲν οὖν θαυμαστὰ καὶ σοφίας μεστὰ παρῆναι ἡ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιστολή.*⁹ Eusebius also has published and praised this epistle. Tillemont, Baronius, and many others are highly offended at it, and suppose that the emperor, when he wrote it, had some evil counsellor at his elbow, either Satan or Eusebius. But the affair was gone too far to be thus composed, and Socrates represents both sides as equally contentious and refractory.¹

⁹ Socr. E. H. i. 8, which Valesius renders: *Et hæc quidem Imperator admirabili sapientia præditus per literas suadebat.* He should have said *prædita* or *plena*, but he seems, for certain good reasons, to have had a mind to translate it wrong.

¹ "Had Constantine persisted in his neutrality, it is probable that the Arian controversy, after some noisy debates and angry invectives, would have discharged its passion in words, and the heresy itself would have fallen into dishonour, almost into oblivion, like so many others. But the firmness of the Emperor was not proof against the importunities of the orthodox prelates, seconded, as some think, by his own theological vanity; a general council was suggested as the only remedy for the evil; and the Emperor would, of course, preside over its deliberations. Still, the matter was some little time in suspense; and that was, perhaps, the most critical moment in ecclesiastical history, in which Constantine determined to convoke the

To settle this and other points, the Nicene council was summoned, consisting of about *three hundred and eighteen* bishops; a² *mystical* number, on which many profound remarks have been made. The first thing they did was to quarrel, and to express their resentments, and to present accusations to the Emperor against one another. So say Socrates, Sozomen, Rufinus. Theodoret favours his brethren in this affair, and seems to throw the fault upon the laity. *Rufinus quidem ait Episcopos variis de causis inter se jurgantes libellos criminationum adversus collegas Constantino obtulisse. Theodoritus vero libellos illos porrectos fuisse dicit a Laicis, qui Episcopos variis de causis accusabant.*³ But the whole story, as it is related by them all, and even by Theodoret, shows that the bishops accused one another. The Emperor burnt all their libels, and exhorted them to peace and unity; so that if they had not been restrained by his authority, and by fear and respect, they would probably have spent their time in altercations.⁴

In ea sententia fuit Socrates, says Bishop Bull,⁵ *ut crederet Concilio Episcoporum vere Universali semper adesse Spiritus Sancti gratiam illuminatricem, quæ eos, utcunque rudes et imperitos (quod tamen Sabinus de Patribus Nicenis falso affirmaverat), ab errore saltem in necessariis Fidei articulis immunes custodiret.* Thus the *infallibility* of General Councils is established. But where, I pray, is this written? And in what part of the New Testament shall we find this important doctrine? What constitutes a General Council? And how shall we know when it is *vere universale*? For this, it seems, is a necessary requisite to draw down infallibility upon it. Have bishops alone a right to vote in a general council? Why are Presbyters excluded? Were even all the Christian bishops invited to the Nicene council? Were the Novatian bishops admitted there? No, says Valesius: they deserved to be shut out as being Schismatics. It may be so; but they were accounted orthodox in points of doctrine, and they had also a plausible claim to admit-

Council of Nice."—Waddington's *History of the Church*, ch. 7. Jortin has suggested, at p. 365, another very plausible method by which the controversy might have been strangled in its infancy.—EDIT.

² See Barnab. Epist. Cath. c. 9, and the commentators. ³ Valesius ad *Theod.* i. 11.

⁴ Socrat. E. H. i. 8. ⁵ Def. Fid. Nic. See Socrates, *ubi supra*.

tance, if they wrought miracles. Socrates tells us that some of them had these extraordinary gifts, and their miracles are as probable as those of Antony, of Hilarion, of Symeon, and of other monks. Four hundred bishops met together at Ariminum: did they constitute a general council? No; it was an Arian council, and therefore it must not be called *Concilium*, but *Conciliabulum*. Thus the question concerning *Universality* is somewhat embarrassed. But let us proceed to something that is not embarrassed, and that is sufficiently plain.

Let us imagine then a council called by a Christian emperor; by a Constantine, a Constantius, a Theodosius, a Justinian; and three or four or five hundred prelates assembled together from all quarters, to decide a theological debate. Let us consider a little by what various motives these various men may be influenced;—as by reverence to the emperor, or to his counsellors and favourites, his slaves and eunuchs; by the fear of offending some great prelate, as a Bishop of Rome or of Alexandria, who had it in his power to insult, vex, and plague all the bishops within and without his jurisdiction; by the dread of passing for heretics, and of being calumniated, reviled, hated, anathematised, excommunicated, imprisoned, banished, fined, beggared, starved, if they refused to submit; by compliance with some active leading and imperious spirits; by a deference to the majority; by a love of dictating and domineering, of applause and respect; by vanity and ambition; by a total ignorance of the question in debate, or a total indifference about it; by private friendships, by enmity and resentment, by old prejudices, by hopes of gain, by an indolent disposition, by good-nature, by the fatigue of attending, and a desire to be at home; by the love of peace and quiet, and a hatred of contention, &c.⁶ Whosoever takes these things into due consideration, will not be disposed to pay a blind deference to the authority of general

⁶ To these considerations, which comprehend, perhaps, the usual motives of human action, Dean Waddington would add “that among so many assembled, many there must have been of sincere intention and earnest piety, and certainly several well instructed in the learning of that age; and the excellence of these persons doubtless so influenced the general character of the Council that, though unable to repress the intemperate violence of some of its members, they were sufficient to conduct it to that decision, which has now been followed by the great majority of Christians for fifteen centuries.” (*Hist. of the Church*, c. 7.)—EDIT.

councils, and will rather be inclined to judge that the council held by the Apostles at Jerusalem was the first and the last in which the Holy Spirit may be affirmed to have presided.⁷

Thus far we may safely go, and submit to an apostolical synod: but if once we proceed one step beyond this, we go we know not whither. If we admit the infallibility of one general council, why not of another? and where shall we stop? At the first Nicene council, A.D. 325, or at the second Nicene council, A.D. 787? They who disclaim private judgment, and believe the infallibility of the Church, act consistently in holding the infallibility of councils; but they who take their faith from the Scriptures, and not from the Church, should be careful not to require nor to yield too much regard to such assemblies, how numerous soever. Numbers in this case go for little, and to them the old proverb may be applied,—*Est turba semper argumentum pessimi*. I would have said *sæpe*, but the verse will not admit it.

If even the Nicene council has small pretensions to infallibility, the subsequent general councils,—as that of Constantinople, and that of Ephesus,—have still less pretensions; as Bishop Bull must have known, and as every one knows who is at all acquainted with their history. A council of gladiators held in an amphitheatre would be as venerable as that of the Constantinopolitan Fathers, if Gregory Nazianzen may be believed. The testimony of this pious and learned Father is very troublesome to the admirers of such assemblies; and they are willing to suppose that it was the effect of peevishness, and that old age and ill-usage had soured his temper in some degree. What would the good man have said, if he had lived

⁷ According to the 21st Article of the Church of England, "General Councils may err, and sometimes have erred, in things pertaining to God;" so that "things ordained by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture." On the other hand, the Church of Rome asserts, "that holy councils have ever the assistance of God's Spirit, and therefore cannot err in their sentences and determinations." See the *Rhemish Annotations* on Acts xv. 28. Now the truth is, that the very fact of meeting for the purpose of consultation presupposes a liability to error; from which nothing but inspiration can secure the assertion of an individual, or the counsels of assemblies. See Burnet, and the other writers on the Thirty-nine Articles.—EDIT.

to see the general council of Ephesus, which was far worse than anything that his eyes had ever beheld? He would have wished himself at the ends of the earth, to be rid of such company; and, as he was a poet, he would have made verses upon the occasion, after the manner of

Pone me pigris ubi nulla campis
Arbor æstiva recreatur aura ;
Quod latus mundi nebulae malusque
Jupiter urget :
Pone sub curru nimium propinqui
Solis, in terra domibus negata.^s

If such councils made righteous decrees, it must have been by strange good-luck.

Several writers of the fourth and following centuries have, indeed, spoken of the Nicene Fathers as of *inspired men*; but we must remember that the epithets *θεόπνευστος* and *θεοφόρος*, like other complimenting titles, were extremely cheap in those days. Eusebius and several of the ancients commend the Nicene bishops in general. Sabinus, Bishop of Heraclea, and of the sect of the Macedonians, called them ignorant and illiterate men, in his collection of councils, which is lost; for which Socrates reprimands him; and Bishop Bull censures him with great vehemence. In the Nicene council there were undoubtedly not a few learned, pious, and virtuous prelates, and holy confessors; and some worthy persons, though not so many, in some of the subsequent general councils; but in such assemblies the best and the most moderate men seldom have the ascendant, and they are often led or driven by others who are far inferior to them in good qualities.

A general council, as we are told, will at least be secured from erring in fundamentals. But, by this way of reasoning, the number of *fundamentals* will be increased beyond measure and without end; and *metaphysical terms of art* will be accounted *fundamental doctrines*, as if the very existence of Christianity could depend upon words not used by the Holy Spirit, unknown to the sacred writers, not to be found in the creeds of the three first centuries, of which different interpretations were given when they were first established, and have been

^s Hor. Carm. I. 22. 16.

given ever since, and which common people most certainly do not and cannot understand. But they are secured, it seems, by that sort of faith without knowledge, which the Church of Rome recommends, and which is called by some *Fides Carbonaria*.

At the Nicene council, Eusebius proposed a Creed, in which he avoided the word *ὁμοούσιος*, and anathematised *every impious heresy*, without specifying *any*: but his advice was not followed, *ὁμοούσιος* was inserted, and the Arian doctrines were anathematised. Disputes, as we may well suppose, ensued amongst the bishops concerning the meaning, and the consequences, of the word *ὁμοούσιος*. Eusebius assented to it, and declared in what sense he understood it. His sense of *consubstantial* was, that *the Son of God was not like created beings, but received his existence and his perfection from the Father in a different and in an ineffable manner*. Thus he took leave to interpret for himself the *ὁμοούσιος*; and the council seems to have given him permission so to do, or at least not to have passed any sort of censure upon him, though they understood more to be contained in that word. If that were really the case, as I think it was, Eusebius did not deceive the council. Others gave other senses to it, and the debate, says Socrates, was like a battle fought in the dark. *Ἡ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου λέξις τινὰς διετάραττε· περὶ ἣν κατατριβόμενοι καὶ ἀκριβολογούμενοι τὸν κατ' ἀλλήλων πόλεμον ἤγειραν· νυκτομαχίας τε οὐδὲν ἀπέιχε τὰ γινόμενα. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀλλήλους ἐφαίνοντο νοοῦντες, ἀφ' ὧν ἀλλήλους βλασφημεῖν ὑπελάμβανον.*⁹ Socrates was a Consubstantialist, so far as to believe even that miracles were wrought by the monks in favour of that doctrine; and yet, upon examining the Epistles written on the controversy by bishops of each party, he could not help concluding that they disputed about words of which they had no ideas, and charged one another with consequences and inferences which neither side would own.

The Council of Antioch, which consisted of Consubstantialists, wrote an epistle to the Emperor Jovian, and explained their doctrine in the following manner:—*Ἀναφέρομεν τῇ σῇ εὐλαβείᾳ, ὅτι τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ πάλαι πρότερον συγκροτηθείσης τὴν πίστιν καὶ ἀποδεχόμεθα καὶ κατέχομεν. Ὅποτε καὶ τὸ δοκοῦν ἐν*

⁹ Socrat. i. 23. et Soz. ii. 18.

αὐτῇ τισί ξένον ὄνομα, τὸ τοῦ Ὁμοουσίου φαμέν, ἀσφαλοῦς τετύχηκε παρὰ τοῖς πατράσιν ἑρμηνείας, σημαινούσης ὅτι ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὁ Ὑιὸς ἐγεννήθη, καὶ ὅτι ὅμοιος κατ' οὐσίαν τῷ Πατρί· οὔτε δέ ὡς πάθους τινὸς περὶ τὴν ἄρρητον γέννησιν ἐπινοούμενου, οὔτε κατὰ τινα χρήσιν Ἑλληνικὴν λαμβάνεται τὸ ὄνομα τῆς οὐσίας· εἰς ἀνατροπὴν δὲ τοῦ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων περὶ τοῦ Ὑιοῦ ἀσεβῶς τολμηθέντος Ἀρείω.¹ This is interpreting *obscurum per obscurius*; and if any one can tell what these Lycophrons meant by οὐσία, he must be very sagacious. All that we can learn from their epistle is, that the word οὐσία, being used by Christian divines, had lost its Pagan signification, and had not acquired a new one.

“ Si aurem præbeamus viris, quorum alioquin auctoritatem spernere nequaquam possumus, de *Synodis* veteribus loquentibus, nobis magnifica oratione describent ἀγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικὰς συνόδους θεοφόρων πατέρων, συναθροισθείσας ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως καὶ ἰσαποστόλου. Quis, auditis his et similibus verbis, religioso quodam horrore et corpore et animo non contremiscat, ac paratus non sit oracula ejusmodi cœtûs avidis auribus excipere, haud aliter ac si cœlo ipso emitterentur? Verùm hæc est (quis crederet?) *abstracta notio* Snodorum, quæ in inconspicua *Idearum republica* coguntur; non imago earum, quæ inter miseros mortales olim congregatæ fuere. Reges ignari—non legent hæc Mohammedani, nec Ethnici, sed ii quorum scire interest, quo fiet ut verum aperte proloquar—Reges, inquam, ignari, nec inter bonos principes numerandi, convocarunt Græculos, qui linguæ acuendæ per totam vitam operam dederant, rerum ipsarum ignaros, contendendi studiosos, perpetuis rixis inter se divisos; et bardos aliquot homines ex occidente, rudiores quidem illos, sed non meliores; iique, post pudendas contentiones, obscurissima quædam dogmata, verbis sæpe parum aptis, auctoritate sua firmant, quæ stupidi populi sine examine adorent, quasi divinitus accepta. Non ficta me loqui norunt qui Synodorum historias legerunt; nec certe vanus erat Gregorius Nazianzenus, qui dixit:—

Οὐδέ τί πον συνόδοισιν δρόθρονος ἔσσομ' ἔγωγε

Χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἄκριτα μαρναμένων.

Ἐνθ' ἔρις, ἔνθα μόθος τε, καὶ αἷσχεα κρυπτὰ πάροιθεν

Εἰς ἓνα δυσμενέων χῶρον ἀγειρόμενα.

¹ Apud Sozom. vi. 4.

Visne aliam *notionem abstractam*? Lege quæ de *Ecclesia repræsentativa*, ut solet vocari, a plurimis olim et nuper scripta sunt: illâ nihil sanctius, nihil doctius, nihil amantius veri excogitari potest. Sed cave ne abstractæ notioni similem ullam in rerum natura quæras, nisi frustra esse velis. Si rem, in qua reperiri oporteret, quod tantis laudibus ornatur, inspicias, delabêris forte ad opinionem Gasparis Scioppii, insignis Grammatici, qui *Ecclesiam repræsentativam* definiebat, *mandram, sive gregem, aut multitudinem jumentorum sive asinorum*; et benigne atque amice locutum esse judicabis, quod *ferarum* non dixerit. Nec aliter de iis sensit Josephus Scaliger, cujus est hoc insigne judicium, in *Scaligeranis*:—*Christianis Orientalibus, Græcis, Syris, hodie nihil pejus; et olim Episcopi Græci fuerunt nequissimi et superbissimi. Eorum Concilia fuerunt meræ conspirationes. Latina Ecclesia longe honestius se gessit, quamvis intus multa et clam pessime fecerint.*²

This description of *General Councils* gave offence to many persons, whose reverence for these assemblies was at least as great as Le Clerc's and Scaliger's disregard. But thus much is certain, that by paying little deference to General Councils few inconveniences arise, compared with those which inevitably follow a blind and tame submission, in points of faith, to human decisions, and to *Public Wisdom*, as some of our controversial doctors have loved to call it, which may be *Public Folly*.

Public Wisdom is a mere *Proteus*; and, not to consider it in Pagan or Mohammedan countries, amongst the Jews it once was the wisdom of Ahab and Jezebel, and afterwards of Annas and Caiaphas; and in Christian regions it has appeared in a hundred shapes. It sets out with a great show of religion: it begins with *the Gospel according to St. Matthew*; and it often ends in *the Gospel according to Mr. Hobbes*.

Ecclesiastical government, in some form, is absolutely necessary, without which no discipline and order can be preserved, and no religious society can well subsist, and which none can be more willing to obey than I am. Yet, *Call no man your Father upon earth; for one is your Father, who is in heaven. Neither be ye called Masters; for one is your Master, even Christ.*³

² Clericus, *Art. Crit.* i. p. 430.

³ Matt. xxiii. 9, 10. Deus dedit omnibus pro virili portione sapientiam; nec

Valesius is a strenuous defender of the sacred authority of General Councils. *Quid per spiritualem legem* [τῇ πνευματικῇ νομοθεσίᾳ] *Theodoritus intelligat, obscurum est. Ego Nicænæ Fidei Symbolum intelligi puto, quo definitum est, Filium Patri consubstantialem esse.* Decreta enim Synodorum, leges sunt Spiritus Sancti. *Nota sunt verba Apostolorum quæ leguntur in Actibus, cap. xv.* Visum est enim Spiritui Sancto et nobis, etc.⁴ Valesius was obliged to maintain such principles, or to give up his religion; and every Protestant who admits these principles, ought by all means to admit the conclusion, and to go over to the Church of Rome.

The fourth General Council, of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, was also divinely inspired and infallible, as we learn from no less a voucher than *Symeon Stylites*:—διὸ καὶ γὰρ ἐγνώρισα τὴν ἐμὴν πρόθεσιν, τὴν περὶ τὴν πίστιν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Καλχηδόνι συνεληλυθότων ἑξακοσίων τριάκοντα, ἐμμένων καὶ ὑποστηριζόμενος ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος φανερωθείσης. Εἰ γὰρ μεταξὺ δύο ἢ τριῶν συνελθόντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ πάρεστιν Σωτὴρ, πῶς μεταξὺ τοσούτων καὶ τηλικούτων ἁγίων πατέρων ἐνεχώρει, εἰ μὴ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' αὐτῶν τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. Thus saith Symeon.⁵ The honest monk talks like an inhabitant of the *middle region*, who lived upon *his pillar*, and knew little of what passed below. The patrons of this doctrine are able to produce a large number of Symeons, and of ancient and modern teachers, who all agree in voting for the inspiration of Synods: for it is a much easier thing to find *monks* than *reasons*; but the former without the latter will be of small service to them.

After all, it has happened sometimes that one council has contradicted another;⁶ and this creates a terrible difficulty, out of which neither Valesius nor Symeon himself can extricate us.

We have a more certain rule by which we may judge of

quia nos illi temporibus antecesserunt, sapientia quoque antecesserunt: quæ si omnibus æqualiter datur, occupari ab antecedentibus non potest.—Sapientiam sibi adimunt, qui sine ullo iudicio inventa majorum probant, et ab aliis pecudum more ducuntur. Sed hoc eos fallit, quod, *majorum* nomine posito, non putant fieri posse ut aut ipsi plus sapiant, quia minores vocantur, aut illi desipuerint, quia majores nominantur.—Lactantius *Div. Inst.* ii. 7. ⁴ Vales. ad Theodor. v. 13.

⁵ Apud Evagrium, ii. 10.

⁶ See Baxter on *Councils*, pp. 99, 445; Jewel's *Apology*, iv. 22. 3, 4; Prideaux's *Fasc. Contr.* iv. 4; Bilson on *Christian Subjection*, Pt. 2; Field on the *Church*, v. 51; Porteus's *Brief Confutation*, p. 30.—EDIT.

Councils, a rule given us by our master, *By their fruits ye shall know them.*⁷ We need only survey their acts and monuments, their behaviour, doctrine, decrees, and censures; and compare them impartially with the morality, the simplicity, the prudence, the charity, and the piety of the Gospel. By this method we may form a tolerable idea of them, though amongst the Fathers of those centuries there was no *Father Paul* to do them justice, and to give us an account of their proceedings.

“*Athanasius* was made bishop, and successor to *Alexander*; because whilst he was deacon he had strenuously opposed *Arius*. *Philostorgius* relates many things of him not at all to his credit, which perhaps are not more to be received than the reports of the *Homoousians* concerning *Arius*; nor yet more to be rejected, since prejudice and partiality were very prevalent on both sides.

“A.D. 330. The Nicene Council by its determinations (A.D. 325) could not appease the dissensions. Great were the contests and the quarrels in Egypt between the *Arians* and the *Athanasians*; and the *Homoousian* writers so represent the affair, as to favour the latter, and to condemn the former in all points. This year a tumult was raised at Antioch on account of the controversy.

“A.D. 335. *Athanasius* was condemned by a council held at Tyre, for having obtained the see of Alexandria by unjustifiable methods, and for other and worse misdemeanors, if *Philostorgius* may be credited.⁸ This historian, though a favourer of the *Arian* cause, yet freely censures *Arius* where he thought him reprehensible, and therefore might be a fair relator of other points.

“In the following year *Athanasius* was accused again by the same bishops who had condemned him at Tyre, and who were now assembled at Constantinople; and the Emperor *Constantine* banished him into Gaul. About this time died *Arius*, by a wonderful judgment of God, as his adversaries afterwards said. But quarrels ran so high in those days, that there is no confiding in the reports of either party.

“A.D. 341. *Athanasius*, who had been honourably recalled from banishment by *Constantine* the younger, was condemned

⁷ Matt. vii. 20.

⁸ Ap. Phot. ii. 11.

and deposed by the Council of Antioch⁹ consisting of about a hundred bishops, of whom a third part were Arians; and¹ Gregory of Cappadocia was put in his place. Julius, bishop of Rome, called a council, and acquitted Athanasius, and condemned the Council of Antioch. Athanasius then returned to Alexandria. Macedonius was appointed bishop of Constantinople, and Hermogenes the præfect endeavoured to put him in possession, and to drive out Paul; but Hermogenes was murdered by the Athanasian populace, who wanted to have Paul for their bishop.

“The Arians, in their council at Antioch, had made a creed and left out the *ὁμοούσιος*. After this they proposed a new confession of faith, which was said to have been the creed of² Lucian the martyr, who was of the same sentiments which were afterwards held by Arius; as Alexander of Alexandria and Philostorgius testify. In this creed the Arians, avoiding the word *consubstantial*, call the Son *ἄτρεπτόν τε καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον τῆς θεότητος, οὐσίας τε καὶ βουλῆς καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης ἀπαράλλακτον εἰκόνα, καὶ πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως*. Valesius translates *ἀπαράλλακτον nullatenus discrepantem*; but, though the word is often to be found in that sense, it signifies also *immutabilem*. This induces me to think that they had a mind to draw up a creed in expressions which might be³ approved by both parties:—an expedient often practised in this controversy.

“A.D. 347. Constans called a council at *Sardica*. Three hundred and seventy bishops were assembled, and, most of them being *Homoousians*, Athanasius was acquitted. But the Arian prelates, withdrawing themselves, met at Philippi, and there made contrary decrees, which also were called *Sardicensian*. Nor would Athanasius have been recalled to Alexandria, if Constantius, moved by the threatening letters of his brother Constans, and for the sake of peace, had not given his consent to it, two years after the Council of Sardica.

⁹ See the remarks of Pagi, in Socrates, p. 84, not. a.

¹ Who came in like a tyrant, and committed many outrages.

² Lucian was highly honoured by the Arians, and some of the most celebrated bishops of that party, as Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris, Theognis, and Leontius, are said to have been his disciples. Philostorgius relates that the body of this Martyr was brought to Nicomedia by a dolphin:—the very dolphin, I suppose, who carried Arion upon his back, and who had the same affection for saints as for musicians.

³ This confession of faith is Catholic, says Du Pin (H. E. ii. p. 325), although the word *Consubstantial* be not in it

"A.D. 350.⁴ A council was held at *Sirmium*, in which Photinus was condemned. The bishops who met there were almost all of them ⁵ Arians, yet were their canons received like those of other councils.

"A.D. 357. Many *Homoousians* were banished, and amongst them *Liberius*, bishop of Rome, and other bishops. *Liberius*, after having remained two years in banishment, subscribed to the condemnation of Athanasius, and published a confession of faith, in which, leaving out the word *ὁμοούσιος*, he declared the Son to be like the Father in all things. At this time the Arians began to be distinguished and divided. Part of them were *Homoiousians*, and part *Anomæans*. The first said that the Son was altogether *ὁμοιοῦσιος*, of like substance, with the Father; the second, that he was *ἀνόμοιος*, unlike, or different, or unequal. Such was the difference between the Arians, if we may trust to the accounts of ancient writers. In the Council of Ancyra, the *Anomæans* were condemned, and it was decreed that two councils should be called, one for the Eastern Churches, at *Seleucia*, another for the Western, at *Ariminum*.

"A. D. 359. At *Seleucia*, the *Homoiousians* and the *Anomæans* contended; the latter were overpowered. Four hundred bishops were assembled at *Ariminum*, of whom about a fourth part were Arians; where, after much wrangling and many delays, most of them subscribed to a creed, in which it was only said that the Son of God was not a creature, like other creatures.

"A. D. 360. *Macedonius*, who was driven away from Constantinople, is said to have published his notions concerning the Holy Ghost. With the rest of the Arians he denied the *consubstantiability* of the Son, and only said that he was like the Father; but he positively affirmed that the Holy Ghost was *κτιστὸν*, created. His successor was *Eudoxius*, an *Anomæan*, who had been bishop of Antioch; on whose removal, great dissensions arose at Antioch. Some followed *Eustathius*, who had been deposed in the year 330; others joined themselves to *Meletius*, who had been ordained by the favourers of *Eudoxius*,

⁴ A.D. 351. Cave. See Socr. ii. 29, and the notes.

⁵ Cave says, *Semiarians*.

and who had deserted Arianism ; whilst a third party, who were Arians, shunned them both, and had *Euzoius* for their bishop.

“ A. D. 363. The Arians, the Semiarians, (so they called the *Homoiousians*), and the Consubstantialists were quarrelling and contending everywhere, particularly in the Eastern parts ; and the Emperor Valens favoured and supported the Arians. Gregory and Basil, who had led a monastic life, left their retirement, to oppose the progress of Arianism.”⁶

A. D. 364. *Apollinaris*, bishop of Laodicea, a man much esteemed for learning and piety, gave rise to a new sect. He thought perhaps that, Christ being *one*, it was impossible that *two persons* could be so united in him as to make *one person*. Thence, as some say, he concluded that in Christ, the *Λόγος* supplied the place of a human soul. It is to be supposed that the Arians either were of the same opinion, or came into it and adopted it. Theodoret⁷ says that *Simon, Basilides, Valentinus, Bardesanes, &c.*, acknowledged Jesus Christ to be God, but said that he was only man in appearance : the Arians held that the Word in Christ supplied the place of a soul. *Apollinaris* taught that the Word was united to a ⁸ living body, but a body not animated with a reasonable soul. *Photinus, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Paul of Samosata*, said that Christ was a mere man.

This may suffice for a summary account of the Athanasian and Arian controversy, during the first forty years. The Pagans, who were by-standers in the times when this controversy was so warmly agitated, could not be much edified, or much disposed to embrace Christianity, when they saw its professors at such implacable variance. This made Ammianus Marcellinus say, that no wild beast was so cruel an enemy to man, as most of the Christians were to each other.⁹

The Alexandrians, a people ¹ naturally satirists, jesters, and buffoons, and the most quarrelsome and seditious of all mankind,

⁶ *Le Clerc*, Compend. Hist.

⁷ Σῶμα ἐμψυχον.

⁸ Epist. 104.

⁹ “ Julian,” says he, “knew their quarrelsome temper ; *nullas infestas hominibus bestias, ut sunt sibi ferales plerique Christianorum, expertus*.—xxii. 5.

¹ The Romans were fond of purchasing Alexandrian boys for slaves, because they were spritely, witty, and extremely impudent. See Stat. *Silv.* ii. l. 72 ; v. 5. 66, and the commentators. The poet Claudian was an Alexandrian, and his works are generally either *panegyrics* or *satires* ; but he shines most in the latter, as appears from his two books against Eutropius.

those I mean who were Pagans, were highly entertained with these debates, and made them the subject of constant ridicule and drollery in their theatres.² They were doubtless of the same opinion with Shaftesbury and his facetious disciples, that *ridicule is the only test of truth.*³

But to leave the profane scurrilities of the Alexandrians, and to return to what is serious, and very serious, let us hear the judgment of Erasmus:⁴ *Quid cogitabunt (a fide Christiana alieni), si viderint rem usque adeo difficilem esse, ut nunquam satis discussum sit quibus verbis de Christo sit loquendum? perinde quasi cum moroso quopiam agas Dæmone, quem in tuam ipsius perniciem evocaris, si quid te fefellerit in verbis præscriptis; ac non potius cum clementissimo Servatore, qui a nobis præter puram simplicemque vitam nihil exigit.* For these and such remarks, Erasmus was frequently accused of Arianism by his enemies. Erasmus, as Le Clerc observes, *Arianismi ab illius ævi Monachis, aliisque non melioribus, insimulatus est; quasi nimio fuisset ingenio, quam ut orthodoxus esse posset.*

Scripture, say the Protestants, is the only rule of faith in matters pertaining to revealed religion, and they say well. There is no other Christianity than this; no other centre of

² Euseb. Vit. Const. ii. 61.

³ For an instance of their national temper and turn of mind, when King Agrippa came to Alexandria (A.D. 38), the Alexandrians, who hated him because he was a Jew, and envied him because he was a king, contrived to set up a rival against him. They took a poor madman, who used to run naked about the streets, and hung a mat over his shoulders by way of robe, and put a paper diadem on his head, and a cane in his hand. When they had thus equipped him, they set him up on a bench in the most conspicuous place in the city; some with sticks on their shoulders stood round him as his guards; others knelt down before him, bringing informations or complaints, or begging favours; whilst all the populace shouted, and called him *Royal Master*.—(Philo in Flacc. p. 970, Ed. Par.) Elias Cretensis, in his Commentaries on Gregory Naz. (p. 316), says that the Alexandrians *Ethnicum quendam hominem insigniter impudicum, veste detracta, pudendis nudatis, in Antistitis solio collocarunt, tanquam si Antistes aliquis foret. Ille vero, Doctoris larvam præ se ferens, in religionem Christianam invehebatur, comico eam risu exhibens, et contrariam ei doctrinam proponens.* He took this from Theodoret:—*Quendam ex suo numero notissimæ turpitudinis, qui una cum veste pudorem simul exuerat, nudum, sicut natus erat, in Ecclesiæ solio collocantes, Concionatorem infamem adversus Christum salutarunt. Nam divinorum verborum loco, turpitudinem proferebat; pro gravibus verbis petulantiam; pro pietate impietatem; pro continentia scortationem, adulterium, masculam venerem, furtum, escam et potum vitæ hominum utilia esse docens.*—(E. H. iv. 22.)

⁴ Epist. 329.

union than this. Whatsoever is not *clearly* delivered there, may be *true*, but cannot be *important*. HÆC MEA EST SENTENTIA, NEQUE ME EX EA VLLIVS VNQVAM AVT DOCTI AVT INDOCTI MOVEBIT ORATIO.

If when the quarrel between Alexander and Arius was grown to such an height as to want a remedy, the Fathers of the Church had, for the sake of peace, agreed to draw up a ⁵ confession of faith in words of Scripture; and to establish the divinity of Christ in the expressions used by the Apostles; every one might have assented to it, and the Arian party would most certainly have received it. The difference of sentiments indeed and of interpretation would not have ceased, but the controversy would have cooled and dwindled away, after every champion had discharged his zeal upon paper, and had written to his heart's content. The Arian notion, that *the Son was created in time*, and that *there was a time when he existed not*, would probably have sunk, as not being the language of the New Testament; and the Macedonian notion, that the Holy Ghost *was created in time*, would have sunk with the other, for the same reason: at least, these opinions would never have been obtruded upon us, as *Articles of Faith*.

One remarkable difference may be observed between the Creeds, which were proposed upon this occasion. The Consubstantialists drew up their Creed with a ⁶ view to exclude and distress the Arians: the Arians had no design to distress the Consubstantialists, but usually proposed creeds to which Athanasius himself might have assented; so that if the compilers were Arians, their creeds were not Arian.

Semiarians agreed with the Arians in rejecting the word *ὁμοούσιος*, but differed from them in carrying the perfections and the dignity of the Son higher than the Arians did, and in

⁵ It had been better to have dropped and dismissed the question; but perhaps this was impracticable, *in tantis animorum incendiis*.

⁶ Auctor ipsorum Eusebius Nicomediensis Epistolâ suâ prodidit dicens:—*Si verum, inquit, Dei Filium et increatum dicimus, homoousion cum Patre incipimus confiteri. Hæc cum lecta esset Epistola in Concilio Nicæno, hoc verbum in Tractatu Fidei posuerunt Patres, quod viderunt adversariis esse formidini, ut tanquam evaginato ab ipsis gladio ipsorum nefandæ caput Hæreseos amputarent.*—*Ambrosius de Fid. ad Grat. L. iii. 7.*

affirming that he was *ὁμοιούσιος*, of like substance, and like to his Father in all things.

If Christ be God the Word, who had glory with the Father before the world was, who was in the beginning, who was before all things, by whom all things were made, &c., the *coeternity* of the *Λόγος* with the Father appears to be a natural and unforced consequence.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to have been of this opinion. He uses a typical argument from the 110th *Psalms*, and draws a parallel between Melchisedec and Christ; intending perhaps to intimate that what Melchisedec was figuratively or typically, that Christ was really and truly. Now Melchisedec *had neither beginning of days nor end of life*,⁷ nothing being recorded in Sacred Writ concerning his birth or his death: consequently the Son of God hath in reality *neither beginning of days nor end of life*.

Dr. Clarke judged it more reasonable to admit, than to reject, the eternity of the Son. "It cannot be denied," says this excellent writer, "that the terms SON, and BEGET, do most properly and necessarily imply *an act of the Father's will*. For whatsoever any person is supposed to do, not by *his power and will*, but by *mere necessity of nature*, it is not indeed *He* that *does* it at all, in any true propriety of speech, but *necessity* only. Nor can it intelligibly be made out, upon what is founded the *authority* of the Father in the *mission* of the Son, if not upon the Son's thus deriving his being from the Father's incomprehensible power and will. HOWEVER, since the attributes and powers of God are evidently as *eternal* as his being, and there never was any time wherein God could not *will* what he pleased, and *do* what he *willed*: and since it is just as easy to conceive God *always acting* as *always existing*, and *operating* before all ages, as easily as *decreeing* before all ages; it will not at all follow, that *that* which is an effect of his *will* and *power*, must *for that reason* necessarily be limited to any definite time. Wherefore not only those ancient writers who were esteemed *Semiarians*, but also the learnedest of the Fathers of the *contrary* side; even they who carried up the generation of the Son the

⁷ Heb. vii. 3.

highest of all; did still, nevertheless, expressly assert it to be an act of the Father's *power* and *will*.—The notion of the *eternity* of the Son is not indeed clearly revealed in Scripture; but it seems most probable that God (ὁ Παντοκράτωρ) did *always* exercise, in some manner or other, his *eternal power* and *will*.—Almost all the old philosophers, who held the *eternity* of the world, did not thereby mean that it was *self-existent*.”⁸

It is affirmed by some learned writers in this controversy, that *eternal generation*, or *derivation*, implies a *manifest contradiction*. This was also the notion of Arius, who concluded that because the Son received his existence from the Father, therefore there must have been a time when he was not. They who say so, are obliged, by unavoidable consequence, to maintain this most unphilosophical assertion, that the Father and First Cause, who has been what he is, supremely wise, good, and powerful, from all eternity, yet could not act, and exert his wisdom, goodness, and power, from all eternity. But this is what they can never prove: and the contrary opinion, namely, the eternal agency of the Almighty, is far more reasonable, and is attended with no other difficulties than those which equally attend a *past eternity*.

“*The eternal generation of the Word is not found in Scripture, nor is he called the Son of God upon any account antecedent to the incarnation.*” So says Dr. Bennet, and so say some other writers on both sides of the controversy. Yet there

⁸ See Clarke's *Second Reply to W.*, Obs. vii. Le Clerc, who often declared a dislike both of the Arian and of the Consubstantial system, thus delivers his opinion of Clarke's *Scripture Doctrine*, &c. :—“Dr. Clarke's doctrine seems to be the same with that of the Nicene Council, excepting that he uses not the word *Consubstantial*. It is not therefore to be wondered that he should have produced so many passages from the ancient Fathers in favour of his hypothesis. They who pretend that the Nicene Council should be the rule of our faith, ought by no means to censure Dr. Clarke, if they understand what that Council meant.”—(*Bibl. Chois.* xxvi. 419.)

Le Clerc has observed, that Christians, forsaking the notions of the Cons substantialists and of the Arians, had come by degrees to a right way of thinking concerning the *unity* of God; namely, that God is *one* in the strictest sense, of one simple, numerical, individual essence; and that the Son and the Holy Ghost are not beings, or essences, or substances, but *modifications*, *manières d'être*, of the Divine essence or substance. The doctrine of a *modal*, *nominal*, *ideal* Trinity terminates unavoidably in the doctrine of *one* Divine *Person* variously manifesting himself. Whether Le Clerc saw and admitted this consequence, I cannot say. He seems to have fluctuated on this matter.—See his *Life of Eusebius*.

are expressions in the New Testament, from which, I think, it may be collected that our Saviour was *Son* of God before his earthly nativity. But howsoever that be, since there is one God and *Father* and *First Cause* of all, the difference between *Son* of God, and *Word* of God, is to us nominal and imperceptible, and both certainly imply a *derivation*. St. John says that all things were made by the *Word*, and St. Paul says that God made all things by his *Son*; whence it appears that the *Word*, and the *Son*, are one and the same person, receiving his existence from one and the same Father. One of the texts on which the ancients founded the generation of the *Son* before his incarnation, is in *Psalms* cx. 3. (according to the LXX.), *Before the morning star I begat thee*:—a text which certainly is full to the purpose, if we admit this ancient translation of it to be right, and our present Hebrew text to want emendation.

To settle the controversial bounds between the Arians, the Semiarians, and the Athanasians or Consubstantialists of those days; and to determine how far they agreed, and how far they differed, and how far they were or were not consistent with themselves; is, if not an impossibility, yet certainly a very difficult task. They were not to be blamed for their inquiries about this subject; their disputes with Jews and Pagans must have unavoidably led them into it: but they should not have reviled and persecuted one another, or required an assent, under pain of excommunication, banishment, infamy, and beggary, to expressions not used by the sacred writers. Is this the reverence and respect which ought to be paid to the Holy Scriptures?

Our Saviour is represented as submitting to sufferings and to death for our sakes, and then exalted by his Father to the highest glory and dominion: and because, in a submission to transient sufferings so amply rewarded, there might seem to be no great example of compassion and condescension, and of *that love which passeth knowledge*, therefore the writers of the New Testament have given us some account of his antecedent condition. They inform us that he who was *rich* became *poor* for our sakes, and quitted a state of splendour and happiness, and *humbled* and *emptied himself*, ἐκένωσε καὶ ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν,⁹ when he became man. This leads us directly to inquire

⁹ Phil. ii. 7, 8.

into the dignity of his nature, concerning which, after all our inquiries, we can know no more than the Holy Scriptures have told us; and from those passages it seems (to me at least) to be a fair inference, that *the Son possessed from all eternity all that the infinite love and infinite power and infinite wisdom of the Father could communicate.*

But here it will be asked, perhaps, what was the doctrine of the Nicene fathers? And what did they mean by *Consubstantiality*? It is impossible to answer this question without using *logical* and *metaphysical* terms. By the word *ὁμοούσιος*, they meant, not *of the same numerical or individual substance*, but *of the same* ¹ *generical substance or subsistence*. As amongst men, a son is *ὁμοούσιος* with his father, that is, *of the same human nature*; so, in ² their opinion, the Son of God is *ὁμοούσιος* with the Father, that is, *of the same divine nature*. By this word, therefore, they intended to express *the same kind of nature*, and so far a *natural equality*. But, according to them, this *natural equality* excluded not a *relative inequality*; a *majority* and *minority*, founded upon the everlasting difference between *giving* and *receiving*, *causing* and *being caused*. They had no notion of distinguishing between *person* and *being*, between an *intelligent agent*, and an *intelligent active substance*, *subsistence*, or *entity*. When they said that the Father was *God*, they meant that he was *God of himself originally*, and *underived*; Θεὸς ἀγέννητος, and ὁ Θεός. When they said that the Son was *God*, they meant that he was *God by generation or derivation*; Θεὸς γεννητός. The *Unity* of God they maintained; and they defended it, first, by considering the Father as the first cause, the only underived and self-existing; secondly, by supposing an intimate, inseparable, and incomprehensible union, connection, indwelling, and coexistence, by which the Father

¹ That *ὁμοούσιος* means *of one substance in kind*, has been shown by Petavius, Curcellæus, Cudworth, Le Clerc, Clark, &c., and to prove it would be *actum agere*.

² Concil. Chalcedonense:—Ὁμοούσιος τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιος ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. *Of one substance with the Father, as to his divinity; and of one substance with us, as to his humanity.* So say the writers of the fifth century, who were called orthodox: but they who speak thus, must have understood by *ὁμοούσιος*, *of one substance in kind*, if we suppose them to have had any ideas affixed to their words, and to have been consistent with themselves; which is more indeed than I would affirm.

was in the Son, and the Son in the Father; and thirdly, by saying that in the Father and the Son there was an unity of will, design, and consent, and one divine power and dominion, originally in the Father, and derivatively in the Son.—Such seems to have been their system, and my design is barely to represent it, and to do it justice.

In process of time, Christians went into a notion that the Son was *ταυτοούσιος* and *μονοούσιος*, of the same individual substance with the Father, and with the Holy Spirit; and they seem to have done this, with a view to secure the doctrine of the unity. The Schoolmen took up the subject, and treated it in their way, which they called *explaining*; and which men of sense call *impenetrable jargon*.

Of all the modern writers upon this controversy, they who have undertaken to prove the doctrine of the Trinity by *Cabalism*, have talked in the most singular manner; though, I doubt not, with very honest and upright intentions. A notable specimen of this way of talking is produced in *Clarke's Letter to Wells*. The author, whosoever he was, informs us, that, ³ *With the ancient is wisdom, means, with the Father and the Son is the Holy Spirit*; that the maid in Job ⁴ is the Virgin Mary; that Christ sent himself, and consequently prayed and returned thanks to himself, interceded with himself, &c.; that whilst he was upon earth, the kingdom of heaven was held in commission, and managed by the angels, &c. &c. He should have added to all his proofs the spurious text, *There are three that bear record, &c.*⁵

One Meyer wrote a book, *De Mystério S. S. Trinitatis ex solius Veteris Testamenti Libris demonstrato*. The text which he urges as the most clear and conclusive of all, is, ⁶ *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord*: in which he is not at all singular, many of his Cabalistic brethren having made the same remark on the same text.

Rabbi Judah has preserved a tradition, that the ancient Jews, in their Liturgy, used this form of prayer, *I and He, save, I pray*: and this *galimatias* is a mystical representation of the

³ Job xii. 12.

⁴ Ib. xxxi. 1, 2.

⁵ 1 John v. 7. The text is in all probability spurious, and yet not to be lightly rejected. *Internal* evidence, however *external* may fail, is decidedly in favour of its authenticity. See Bishop Middleton, on the *Greek Article*; and Bishop Burgess's Tracts on the *Divinity of Christ*.—EDIT.

⁶ Deut. vi. 4.

Trinity, according to some persons who were learned men, but too much addicted to Rabbinism.⁷

The famous Postellus observed that there were *eleven thousand* proofs of the Trinity in the Old Testament, interpreted rightly, that is, ἐτυμολογικομυστικοκαβαλιστικῶς.⁸

Few controversies have been carried on with less temper and with less prudence than this. Before the fourth century was ended, the Consubstantialists differed and disputed amongst themselves, whether in the Trinity there were three *hypostases*, or one *hypostasis*: part of them held the first, and part, the second opinion; and it has been supposed by some, that they had notions directly contrary to each other: but the truth is that they only misunderstood one another, and were in reality of the same mind. For the word ὑπόστασις was ambiguous, and had two senses. In the first sense, *hypostasis* is *the existence of a thing, or the manner in which it exists*; in the second sense it is *the existing thing, or the substance itself*. Three human souls have only one *hypostasis*, in the first sense; that is, one and the same kind of nature, consisting of intelligence, activity, &c.: but in the second sense they are three *hypostases*, that is, three intelligent active beings. The Consubstantialists, who said that in the Trinity there was one *hypostasis*, took the word in the first sense; and their brethren who said there were three *hypostases*, took the word in the second sense; and thus the dispute was verbal, and as soon as they came to understand one another, they were reconciled.

In the fourth century, the Consubstantialists began the per-

⁷ See Jac. Alting. *Gram. Hebr.* Exerc. iii., and Vitranga in *Jesai.* xliii. p. 469.

⁸ "Your friend," says Clarke to Nelson, "being a sincere and sober-minded man, has entered only a little way into these traditionary explications of Scripture; but those who have gone far into them, have given such visionary and Cabalistical interpretations, especially of the Old Testament, as give too sad occasion for infidels to look upon all religion as enthusiasm, and particularly have caused the study of the Hebrew language, which of itself is a plain, easy, inartificial language, to be brought, by men of weak judgment abusing it, into the utmost contempt." Abbadie, a man of vivacity and of a warm imagination, wrote two treatises: in the one he proved with much spirit and elegance the truth of natural and revealed religion, in the other he defended the divinity of Christ; but how? By laying down his own notion of it, and then arguing that if it was not true, our Saviour was what is too shocking to be named or thought of, and what no Mahometan would call him. This odious indiscretion has been frequent amongst disputers of more zeal than judgment.

secution, by excommunicating and banishing their adversaries. After the death of Constantine, Constantius persecuted the Consubstantialists; and the Arians under his protection, as afterwards under Valens, were guilty of many horrible outrages and cruelties, which must have hurt their cause greatly, and have made honest men hold them in abomination. Julian gave liberty to all the contenders to fight it out in disputation, and recalled those whom Constantius had banished. Jovian favoured the Consubstantialists during his short reign. Valentinian, like a wise prince, kept an even hand between both parties, and would not be the tool of either. Valens at the same time persecuted the Consubstantialists in his dominions. Gratian and Theodosius oppressed the Arians. The Arians were also divided into sects which anathematised and plagued each other. But Arianism subsisted, and made a considerable figure for above three hundred years, and was at last destroyed by violence and persecution.⁹

In the fourth century were held thirteen councils against Arius, fifteen for him, and seventeen for the Semiarrians; in all, forty-five.

How could the Arians, in the time of Constantius and Valens, bring themselves to such an unchristian persecuting temper? How could they oppress their fellow-Christians the Consubstantialists, who, supposing them to have been in an error, fell into it through a religious fear of ascribing too little to their Redeemer, and of not paying him sufficient honour? Can a man love his Saviour, and hate his brother for a mistake of this kind? And how could the Consubstantialists persuade themselves that an Arian, who perhaps had suffered for professing Christianity in times of distress, who believed Christ to be his Maker, his Saviour, his King, and his Judge, would *choose* to detract from his dignity, and to offend him in whom he placed all his hopes of salvation? Human nature is not capable of this folly; and if the man was in an error, yet in such a person the error must have been involuntary; a mere defect of the understanding, and not a fault of the will.

A Christian, and a lover of peace, who lived in obscurity, and whose name I cannot tell, stood up, and said:—"My brethren,

⁹ See Bayle's *Dict.*, under ARIUS.

the things to be believed are few, the things to be done are many; but you behave yourselves, as if the reverse of this were true. St. Paul tells you, *The Grace of God that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men; teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearance of the great God, and [of] our Saviour Jesus Christ.*¹ Concerning the nature of *Jesus* you can dispute incessantly, and concerning the word *Grace* you will probably dispute no less; but the rest of the sentence you disregard as of small consequence or importance. What, I beseech you, must the Jews and the Pagans conceive of you and of your religion? And what do the holy angels think, who look down upon your contentions? Those blessed and compassionate Spirits pity you, and think you mere children. But when from contending you proceed to beating your fellow-servants, to persecuting and destroying, they consider you as most malicious and wicked children; their pity is changed into indignation, and they would strike you dead, if the Supreme Governor did not stay their hand, and remind them that such disorders must needs arise, and shall one day be rectified." So said this *Unknown*; but behold the consequence! The Consubstantialists called him an Arian, and the Arians called him a Consubstantialist.

The Nicene Fathers having anathematised the Arians, the emperor seconded them, and banished Arius and the bishops who sided with him; and ordered the books of Arius to be burnt; and added, *If any man be found to have concealed a copy of those books, and not to have instantly produced it and thrown it into the fire, he shall be put to death. The Lord be with you all.*² Constantine's conduct was variable afterwards; for he certainly understood not this perplexed and obscure controversy, and he acted as he was influenced at different times by the ecclesiastics of each party, who accused one another not only of heterodoxy, but of being enemies to the emperor, and of other faults and misdemeanors.

The Creed of Arius, which he delivered to Constantine, and

¹ Tit. ii. 11—13. The word *of*, inserted in brackets, is not sanctioned by the original, which should be rendered, *the glorious appearance of the great God, EVEN our Saviour Jesus Christ.* See Middleton on the *Greek Article*.—EDIT.

² Socrat. i. p. 32.

upon which the emperor ordered him to be recalled and restored, is thus:—"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty; and in our Lord Jesus Christ his Son, begotten of him before all ages, God the Word, by whom all things were made in heaven and in earth, who descended and was incarnate, suffered, arose, and ascended into heaven, and will come again to judge the living and the dead. We believe in the Holy Ghost, the resurrection of the flesh, the life to come, and the kingdom of heaven; and in one Catholic Church of God dispersed over all the earth. This faith we have received from the holy Gospels, in which the Lord says to his disciples, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost*. If we do not believe these things, and truly acknowledge the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as the whole Catholic Church and the Scriptures teach, to which we yield an assent in all things, God is our judge both now and at the day of judgment."³

Arius died suddenly (A.D. 336); upon which the opinions were various. Some ascribed it to a violent distemper; others to his excess of joy, at finding his affairs in a good situation; others called it a judgment; lastly, the Arians said that his adversaries had killed him by some wicked arts, *γοητείας*. And surely it is not impossible that, amongst his numerous enemies, there might be one who would not scruple to give him a dose, and to send him out of the way. Athanasius, as we may suppose, accounted it an unquestionable miracle, and a divine judgment upon him for perjury; and uses the same words in which the Scriptures describe the death of Judas:—"Ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἐξελθὼν, ὥσπερ δίκην δούς, κατέπεσε καὶ, πρηνὴς γενόμενος, ἐλάκησε μέσος."⁴

It is thought by Valesius that the Arius, who was reconciled to the Church at the Council of Jerusalem in 335, was not the more celebrated Arius, but another ecclesiastic of the same party; but this opinion is pretty generally rejected.⁵

"Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, refused to receive

³ Socr. i. 26; Soz. ii. 27.

⁴ Apud Sozom. ii. 30. George Valla, a Professor of Humanity, died in the same manner as was reported of Arius. *Dum corpori vacaturus excrementa cibi dejecit, animam etiam morte subitanea exhalavit*. Such accidents befall one as well as another. See Bayle's reflections upon it (Dict. VALLA).

⁵ See the notes on Socr. i. 33, and Soz. ii. 30; and Bayle Dict. in ARIUS.

Arius to communion, though the emperor had ordered him to do it, and though the Arian bishops were determined to conduct Arius to church in spite of Alexander. In this extremity, not knowing how to act a consistent part, and to proceed as he had begun, he shut himself up, as history says, in the church; and there prayed most devoutly to God, not that he himself might be instructed what he should think of these things, and how he should act, or that Arius might be converted from his errors; but his prayer was, *that if the opinions of Arius were true, he himself might not live to see the day when they were to be discussed; and that if he himself was orthodox, Arius who had been the cause of so many evils, might be punished for his impiety.* A prayer which had so little charity in it, and by which it appeared that the prelate was more solicitous for his own honour than for the truth, was however successful; and Arius died, either on that day or on the day following.”⁶ But perhaps the story was made by the Athanasians after the event, and the bishop did not pray in this strange manner.

Nothing had been decreed by the Nicene Council concerning the nature of the Holy Ghost, and no controversy was raised on that subject, till Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, taught that the Holy Ghost was *a creature*. They who afterwards held that notion were called *Macedonians*, or *Marathonians*, from one Marathonius, bishop of Nicomedia. The Arians were probably of the same opinion.

The Semiarians assembled a Council at Seleucia, and drew up a Creed, in these words:—“We acknowledge and believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of things visible and invisible: We believe also in our Lord Jesus Christ, his Son, begotten of him *without passion* before all ages, God the Word, the only begotten of God, (*who is*) light, life, truth, and wisdom, by whom all things were made, in heaven and upon earth, visible and invisible. We believe that in the end of ages, to abolish sin, he assumed flesh of the holy Virgin Mary, and became man, and suffered for our offences, and rose again, and was taken up into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and shall come again with glory to judge the living and the dead. We believe also in the Holy Ghost, which our Lord

⁶ *Le Clerc*, Bibl. Univ. x. 474.

⁷ ἀπαθῶς.

and Saviour called a ^s *Paraclete*, and promised to send, and did send to his disciples after his departure; by which also he sanctifies all those in the church who believe, and are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”^s Socrates, who was a candid man, seems to approve of this Creed, and says, *Ego vero affirmo, si ab initio de Nicæna fide ita sensissent tum ii qui ante istos vixerant, tum qui illos subsecuti sunt, cessaturam fuisse quæstionem omnem et contentionem, nec violentum et rationis expertem tumultum in Ecclesia fuisse valiturum. Sed quemadmodum ista se habeant, prudentioribus judicandum relinquo.*

The Nicene Creed:—“We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten *and* only-begotten of the Father, that is, ¹ of the substance of the Father; God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made both in heaven and in earth: who for us men and for our salvation descended and was incarnate, and was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day, ascended into the heavens, and will come to judge the living and the dead. (*We believe*) also in the Holy Ghost.—The holy Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes those who say that there was a time when the Son of God was not; and that before he was begotten he was not; and that he was made out of nothing, or out of another substance or essence, and is created, or changeable, or alterable.”²

Such was the Nicene Creed, as it stood originally, and before it was interpolated by subsequent councils. Our church has dropped the anathematising clauses at the end; and one cannot help wishing that the Nicene Fathers had done the same. The Christians in times following were perpetually making anathematisms, even upon the slightest and poorest occasions; and it is really a wonder that they did not at last insert in their Litanies, *We beseech thee to curse and confound the Pelagians, Semipelagians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Jacobites, Iconoclasts, and all heretics and schismatics.*

^s Comforter, or advocate.

⁹ Socr. ii. 40.

¹ Of, or from, or out of the substance of the Father:—ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς.

² Apud Socr. i. 8.

XXIX. OF THE AFFAIRS OF THE CHRISTIANS GENERALLY
UNDER CONSTANTINE.

1. ABOUT the time of Constantine, Christian festivals and holidays began to take place of Pagan solemnities.

2. The council of *Arles* was held A.D. 314, on account of the Donatists. The tenth canon of this council exhorts men, whose wives had been convicted of adultery, not to marry again until the adulteress were dead. An unreasonable request.

3. When Constantine was about to make war with Licinius, there was a wonderful apparition, says Eusebius³:—several regiments of Constantine's soldiers were seen at noonday marching, as victorious, through the cities belonging to Licinius. Eusebius however had the discretion to introduce the story with a *φασί*, *they say*, and took care by so doing to affirm nothing that was not true; for without question there were people enough who said so. But in his Life of Constantine, he is to be considered as an orator and a panegyrist, rather than as an historian. *Nazarius*, who was a Pagan, in his Panegyric of Constantine, mentions such a miracle of an army descending from heaven, to assist that prince against Maxentius. *In ore denique est omnium Galliarum exercitus visos, qui se divinitus missos præ se ferebant. Illi cælo lapsi, illi divinitus missi, gloriabantur quod tibi militabant.* “*In ore est omnium Galliarum,*” quoth he. These Gauls were what the French call *des Témoins Normans*, or *Norman witnesses*.

It is strange, says Le Clerc,⁴ that no Christian author hath mentioned these angels, whom God sent to assist Constantine; and that *Nazarius*, who speaks of this miracle, says nothing of that of the cross.

Constantine transferred the seat of empire to *Byzantium*, which he embellished, enlarged, and made equal to ancient Rome, and to which he gave his own name; by which he certainly disoblinded the Roman senate and people. This change contributed to weaken the western part of the empire, and to bring on its dissolution. But whether it were prudent or no, politically considered, it seems to have been of no moral import; virtue and religion and liberty neither gained nor lost by it; nor, in all

³ Vit. Const. ii. 6.

⁴ Bibl. Chois. iii. 352.

probability, could the Roman empire have continued entire upon the foot that it was in the time of Constantine, though Rome had remained the unrivalled city, and the usual place of the Emperor's residence.

Constantine had a divine revelation to build Constantinople, says Sozomen; and the emperor himself⁵ affirmed the same in one of his laws; and, according to Philostorgius, he declared that he was guided by a heavenly vision in tracing the extent of the new city. In this city no Pagan temples, rites, and ceremonies were permitted, say Eusebius, Sozomen, and Orosius: Zosimus says the contrary. Thus much is certain, that Christianity prevailed far more there than at Rome.⁶

When Constantine went to war, he carried with him a tent, in form of a chapel, where he prayed to God, and had Presbyters and deacons to perform divine service; and thence began the custom in the Roman army for each legion to have a chaplain.⁷

As he was on many occasions generous and liberal, and did so much for the church, and gave so much to ecclesiastics,⁸ he might have extended his favours also to men of letters; but it appears not that he signalised himself that way. In his reign, and in the fourth century, as religious and metaphysical quarrels ran high, and monkery grew and prospered, and miracles abounded, so liberal arts and sciences and polite literature fell into a declining condition. He seems to have been possessed with a *building spirit*, and spent immense sums upon houses, palaces, and⁹ churches; and particularly upon Constantinople. This, and his profuse gifts to some who deserved them, and to others who deserved them not, obliged him to burden his people with taxes. He built a church, and dedicated it to the twelve apostles, and intended to be buried there for the benefit of his soul:—ὡς ἂν καὶ μετὰ τελευτὴν ἀξιῶτο τῶν ἐνταυθοῖ μελλουσῶν ἐπὶ τιμῇ τῶν Ἀποστόλων συντελεῖσθαι εὐχῶν, ὡφέλειαν ψυχῆς ὀνησιφόρον τὴν τῶνδε μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι αὐτῷ πιστεύων.¹ These things

⁵ Or seemed to affirm it. *Pro commoditate Urbis, quam æterno nomine, jubente Deo, donavimus, hæc vobis privilegia credidimus deferenda.* (Cod. Th. L. xiii. Tit. v. p. 63; where see Gothofred.) ⁶ Soz. ii. 3. ⁷ Ibid. i. 8.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Joannes Ciampini gives an account of them in a treatise *de Sacris Ædificiis a Constantino Magno constructis.* ¹ Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 60.

Eusebius mentions with approbation, and they show how even such men as he were not free from superstition.

Constantine was perhaps the first Christian who was buried in a church, which afterwards became a common practice.

There is a story about him in Chrysostom,² related by Flavian, which is much to his credit. Some rioters had done outrage to one of his statues; and they, who excited him to revenge and severity, told him, amongst other things, that his face had been pelted with stones, and all over bruised and battered. He put his hand to his face, and said that he did not feel it.

He was neither so good as Christian writers describe him, nor so bad as some Pagans represent him. He must have greatly offended the latter, since he not only established Christianity, but began the destruction of Paganism by various discouragements; by shutting up some temples, pulling down some, and stripping others of their Gods and ornaments. He was indeed guilty of several faults; but, upon the whole, his good qualities may perhaps outweigh the bad.³ Fleury observes very prettily: *On ne se trompera point sur Constantin, en croyant le mal qu'en dit Eusèbe, et le bien qu'en dit Zosime.* Eutropius hath judged freely of him, and not amiss. *Insolentia rerum secundarum aliquantum Constantinum ex illa favorabili animi docilitate mutavit. Primum necessitudines persecutus, egregium virum et sororis filium, omnimodæ indolis juvenem, interfecit; mox uxorem; post numerosos*

² T. i. Orat. 20.

³ Whatever may have been the general bearing of Constantine's moral conduct, there can be little doubt of the sincerity of his conversion to the faith of the Gospel. It may be very possible that he was not altogether uninfluenced in the first instance by his political interests; but, in such case, he must have been actuated by a conviction of the growing importance of Christianity, and this very motive of action would have had a strong tendency to persuade him of its inherent claims to attention and respect. It is not requisite to canvass at length the grounds upon which his sincerity has been questioned: but his consistent and unwavering adherence to his profession during the whole of his reign; the diligence with which he investigated the evidence, and the zeal with which he maintained the truth, of his adopted religion; the devotion with which he celebrated the festivals, and enforced the ordinances of the Church; the countenance which he showed to Christian writers and teachers; his inscription of the Cross on the Imperial Standard; and the circumstances attending his last illness and death; are altogether irreconcilable with the idea of a mere hypocritical adoption of a political creed.—EDIT.

*amicos. Vir primo imperii tempore optimis Principibus, ultimo mediis comparandus.*⁴

Excessive honours, and little short of divine, were paid by the Christians to his name, to his tomb, and to his statue, after his death. He was called a saint, and a saint equal to the apostles; and as Proculus forswore himself to make Romulus a God, so Nicephorus had the effrontery to declare that God had endued the urn and the statue of Constantine with miraculous powers; and that whosoever touched them was healed of all diseases and infirmities. The Pagans, who scorned to be less complaisant than the Christians, made him a god.⁵

4. *Eustathius*, bishop of Antioch, a great friend of Athanasius, was deposed by the Synod of Antioch, for Sabellianism (A.D. 327). *Some relate, says Socrates, that it was for other faults, which yet they have not mentioned: and indeed it is a custom with our spiritual rulers, when they depose a man, to load him with general accusations, and to call him irreligious and impious; but never to specify, and declare particularly, of what impiety he is guilty.*⁶ Whosoever sits down to examine the state of the Christian world, civil and religious, in the fourth and fifth centuries, if he be not strangely prejudiced, will find his veneration for those days to wear off apace; and, if he lives in a Protestant country, will learn perhaps to be contented with his own times, which, such as they are, deserve the preference.

5. Rufinus, and from him Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, give us an account of the conversion of some⁷ Indian nations in the time of Constantine, of which the substance is as follows:—These Indians, being at variance with the Romans, slew all the passengers in a ship which put into one of their harbours, except two boys, *Fruventius* and *Ædesius*; whom *Meropius*, a Chris-

⁴ Eutrop. Epit. x.

⁵ Philostorg. ii. 17; Theodoret, i. 34; Nicephorus, viii. 55; Eutropius, *ubi supra*.

⁶ Socr. i. 24. Ὡς μὲν οὖν τινες φασίν, δι' ἄλλας οὐκ ἀγαθὰς αἰτίας φανερώς γὰρ οὐκ εἰρήκασιν. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων εἰώθασιν τῶν καθαιρουμένων ποιεῖν οἱ ἐπίσκοποι, κατηγοροῦντες μὲν καὶ ἀσεβεῖν λέγοντες, τὰς δὲ αἰτίας τῆς ἀσεβείας οὐ προστιθέντες.

⁷ Or of a people of Æthiopia, whose capital was *Auxumis*. Tillemont has collected many things concerning *Fruventius* (H. E. vii. 284). Ludolphus, in his *Historia Æthiopica*, says, that, according to the Greek, Latin, and Æthiopic writers, the *Abyssines* were converted by *Fruventius*; and that Cedrenus and Nicephorus were mistaken in placing the conversion of this people so low as the reign of Justinian.

tian and a philosopher, of Tyre, and a relation of theirs, had taken along with him. These boys were presented to the king of the country, who made Frumentius his secretary, and Ædesius his cup-bearer. The king died, leaving a wife and a young child; and Frumentius administered the affairs of the kingdom, together with Ædesius, during the minority of the young king. Frumentius, inquiring amongst the Roman merchants who traded there, found some Christians, who under his protection assembled together, and built a church, and catechised some of the Indians. Frumentius, resigning his office, which he had filled with credit and integrity, got leave to return home with Ædesius; and, coming to Alexandria, exhorted Athanasius to send over some ecclesiastics to that country. He was prevailed upon to go back himself, as the most proper person; and, being made a bishop, he preached the gospel there with great success, *healing the sick, and working many miracles*. This account Rufinus received from Ædesius, who was returned home to Tyre, and was there a Presbyter of the church.^s

About the same time the *Iberi* received Christianity, as we learn from Rufinus; and, after him, from Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. The *Iberi* inhabited a country between the Euxine sea and the Caspian, which is now called *Georgia*. A Christian woman, who was a captive, had gained the esteem and respect of the people by her good behaviour. It was a custom there to carry sick children from house to house, to ask advice of the neighbourhood. A child being brought to her, she put him upon her bed, and prayed for him, and restored him to health. The queen of the country, being very ill, and hearing of this, came to her; and was healed in like manner. The king and the queen offered her great rewards, which she would not accept, but exhorted them to embrace her religion. Thus far the story has a good face, but—*Desinit in piscem mulier formosa superne*. For the present, the exhortations of the female captive had no effect upon the king. Afterwards, as he was hunting in a forest, it grew quite dark on a sudden, and he knew not which way to go, and was in great distress: he called upon Jesus Christ, and the daylight instantly returned. Upon this he sent for the woman, was instructed by her in Christianity, recommended

^s Socrates, i. 19; Sozomen, ii. 24; Theodoret, i. 23; Rufinus.

it to his subjects, and sent for proper teachers to⁹ Constantine; who received his messengers with great kindness, and appointed a bishop to go with them. In the mean time the king erected a church, at the building of which a very improbable miracle is related to have been wrought; a pillar was moved and raised up, and suspended in the air, by the prayers of the woman. Rufinus says that he had this account from *Bacurius*. *Bacurius* was prince of the *Iberi*, and a general in the Roman service, under Valens and Theodosius, about forty years after the conversion of that people. Zosimus, who was a zealous Pagan, commends him as a very brave and very honest man. "Ελκων μὲν ἐξ Ἀρμενίας τὸ γένος, ἔξω δὲ πάσης κακοηθείας ἀνὴρ, μετὰ τοῦ τὰ πολεμικὰ πεπαιδευθῆναι.¹

As to the facts in these two relations, which are not miraculous, there is no sufficient reason to deny them; but the preternatural part, particularly in the² story of the *Iberi*, calls loudly for abatements. However, the occasion, the converting of two nations to Christianity, might be worthy of miracles, such as healing the diseased; and we should rather expect to find them here, than in the dens of Monks, or at the graves of the Martyrs. Eusebius says nothing at all of these transactions. The miracle of the *pillar* was perhaps borrowed from Pliny;³ that of the *darkness* from Ovid.⁴

⁹ To this Constantine seems to allude in his Epistle to the Council of Tyre. *Mea certe opera divino Numini inserviente, ubique terrarum pax viget; ipsis etiam barbaris Dei nomen sincere venerantibus, qui ad hoc usque tempus veritatem ignoraverant.* (Socr. i. 34; Soz. ii. 28).

¹ Zosim. iv. See Rufinus, x. 10; Socrates, i. 20; Sozomen, ii. 7; Theodoret, i. 24.

² Miracles have now ceased amongst this people, by their own acknowledgment. When the Popish Missionaries tell the Georgians what miracles are still wrought in the Church of Rome, the Georgians answer, *That is a lie*, for we have none now wrought amongst us. (*Galani Historia Armenica*).

³ Plin. N. H. xxxvi. 21.—"Summa miracula, epistylia tantæ molis attolli potuisse.—Difficillime hoc contigit in limine ipso quod foribus imponebat. Etenim ea maxima moles fuit: nec sedit in cubili, anxio artifice, mortis destinatione suprema. Traduntque in ea cogitatione fessum nocturno tempore in quiete vidisse præsentem Deam, cui templum fiebat, hortantem ut viveret: se composuisse lapidem: atque ita postero die apparuit, et pondere ipso correctus videbatur." He speaks of the temple of the Ephesian Diana.

⁴ Ovid. Met. xiv. 342.—Exierat tecto Laurentes Picus in agros,

Indigenas fixurus apros:—

Tum quoque cantato densatur carmine cœlum,

Et nebulas exhalat humus, cæcisque vagantur

Limitibus comites, et abest custodia regi.

To these missionaries we may add an Arian missionary, who flourished about the same time; and whose history is thus delivered by Philostorgius:—Constantius, like his father Constantine, was very desirous to spread the Gospel in foreign parts. He sent an embassy to a people called *Homeritæ*, supposed to have been the ancient *Sabæans*, and the posterity of Abraham by Keturah, dwelling in Arabia Felix. They circumcised their children on the eighth day, and sacrificed to the sun, moon, and dæmons of the country, and many Jews dwelt amongst them. The Emperor sent magnificent presents to their Prince, and desired he would permit churches to be built in his dominions for the Roman merchants who resorted thither, and for those natives who should embrace Christianity.

One of the principal ambassadors was Theophilus an Indian, who in his youth had been sent an hostage to Constantine, from the inhabitants of the island Diu; and, settling at Rome, led a monastic life, and had a great reputation for sanctity. Eusebius of Nicomedia had ordained him deacon, and upon this occasion the Arians made him a bishop. Perhaps, says Valesius, they did this through emulation, and to equal one of their own sect to Frumentius, who had been consecrated and sent to Ethiopia in like manner by Athanasius.

Theophilus preached the Gospel to the *Homeritæ*; was opposed violently by the Jews, whom he put to silence *by working miracles*; converted the king and many of the people; and established Christianity in these parts. After this he went to Diu, to visit his own country, and passed through many regions of India where the Gospel was already received, and where he rectified some irregularities in practice: for as to matters of faith, there was nothing amiss, says Philostorgius; and they were all of the Arian persuasion. Thence he went to the Ethiopians called *Auxumitæ*, and settled things pertaining to religion. Then he returned to Rome; was highly honoured by the Emperor; remained with the title of bishop, but without any particular Church or Diocese; and was esteemed and beloved by all those of his own sect, as a most excellent and pious man.⁵

⁵ See Gothofred on the Cod. Th. L. xii. Tit. xii. p. 582.

⁶ "Tradit Philostorgius Auxumitas a Theophilo Ariano conversos tempore Con-

Constantius, and Gallus his nephew, had sworn friendship and fidelity to each other in the presence of this Theophilus: therefore when Constantius was resolved to destroy Gallus, Theophilus interposed and exclaimed against it, upon which Constantius banished him. But afterwards, the Emperor's beloved wife being very ill, he had recourse to Theophilus, who was reported to work miracles and to heal the sick. He therefore recalled him, owned his fault, begged pardon, and intreated him earnestly to cure his wife. Theophilus laid his hands upon her, and she recovered. Yet after this, he banished Theophilus a second time, suspecting him to have been a favourer of Gallus.

Theophilus is said to have raised a woman from the dead. *Aiunt etiam eum aliquando Antiochiæ Judæam quandam ex mortuis suscitasse. Id autem affirmat Thalassius, qui cum illo diutissime versatus est, et in hujusmodi rebus extra suspicionem est mendacii: et qui alioqui haud paucos habet hujus rei testes, qui eodem tempore vixerunt.* So Suidas, who is supposed to have taken it from Philostorgius.

6. Under Constantine lived *Spyridon*, bishop of a city in Cyprus. Socrates⁸ and Sozomen⁹ have recorded some incredible miracles wrought by him; and also his preferring works of charity to the observation of a fast, his giving meat to a weary

stantii; cum populi istius conversio revera tribuenda sit Frumentio orthodoxo, ordinato ab Athanasio."—Lowth. To contradict Philostorgius, he makes him affirm more than his words imply (ii. p. 439):—τοῖς Ἀλεξουμήταις δὲ παραγεγὼνός, καὶ τὰ ἐκείσε καταστησάμενος, τῆς ἐπὶ Ῥωμαίους ἀνακομιδῆς εἶχετο.

7 "Philostorgius says that Theophilus the Indian, his pretended Apostle of Arianism, having been banished, was recalled by Constantius to heal his wife, and that he did heal her miraculously. Photius seems to deride this miracle by his manner of relating it, and we know how little credit Philostorgius deserves, especially in the miracles which he ascribes to those of his own sect. But moreover we are assured that the distemper, of which he says that the Empress was cured by Theophilus, and which he calls *μητρομανία*, was the very distemper of which she died, according to Zonaras. For though Theophilus (*he should have said* Philostorgius) names not the Empress, there is no question but that he means Eusebia." (Tillemont, Hist. des Emp. iv. 677.) That Photius speaks contemptuously of the cure, is more than I can discern. See Philostorg. p. 504. I blame not Tillemont for rejecting all these miracles, which seem to have been rumours raised and spread to serve a party: but the true reason of his disbelief is that they were Arian miracles; and if they had been reported concerning Athanasius, all difficulties would have been smoothed over, and accounted of small moment.

⁸ Socr. i. 12.

⁹ Soz. i. 11.

traveller on a day in Lent, and eating along with him to encourage him.

7. *Agapetus*, an Arian, was at first a soldier, then a Presbyter, and then Bishop of Synnada. He raised the dead, and healed the sick, and wrought various miracles, and converted a great number of Pagans; if we may believe Philostorgius.¹ Eusebius has made no mention of this Saint.

8. The greatest of all wonders, which is said to have happened in the days of Constantine, was the discovery of the *True Cross*; which immediately produced the superstitious veneration of it, and ended in the grossest idolatry, and in worshipping the very wood. "Nothing," says Tillemont, "is more certain, for it is attested by Rufinus, Sulpitius Severus, Theodoret, Socrates, Sozomen, Ambrose, Paulinus, and Chrysostom."² I cannot give a better account of this affair, as it stands in Rufinus, &c., than in the words of Tillemont; which are extremely well adapted to the story, and full of what the French call *unction*, and the English, *canting*. But first we will transcribe a few lines from another author.

"It is said that Constantine found the cross of Jesus Christ, and that many miracles were wrought by it. And yet it is surprising enough, that Eusebius, eye-witness of these transactions, who exactly describes all the circumstances in the discovery of the sepulchre of Christ, and who forgets nothing that could turn to the advantage of religion, says not a single word either of the cross, or of the miracles which are pretended to have been performed by it." Thus Du Pin, fairly and honestly.³ Now for

¹ P. 481.

² "Historia hæc de inventione Sanctæ Crucis non occurrit apud Eusebium. Verum Cyrillus Episcopus Hierosolymitanus, qui eodem seculo vixit, aperte testatur lignum Sanctæ Crucis Imperatori Constantino divinitus ostensum. Item in Catechesi de ejus inventione loquitur, ut de re omnibus nota. Quocirca de historiæ hujus fide dubitari non potest."—Lowth *ad Socrat.* i. 17. What did this Protestant divine of ours mean? Could he believe that the true cross was found? Or would he only say that a pretended one was discovered?

³ Bibl. ii. 15. This worthy man suffered, as such men commonly do, for his frankness and candour. "The Archbishop of Paris published an Ordinance against his *Bibliothèque*, and condemned it as containing several propositions false, rash, scandalous, capable of offending pious ears tending to weaken the proofs of Tradition for the authority of Canonical Books; and for many other articles of faith injurious to General Councils;

Tillemont :—" When Saint Helena, the mother of Constantine, was arrived at Jerusalem, and had begun to visit the sacred places, the Holy Ghost inflamed her with a desire to find the wood of the cross. But there was no person who had ever seen it, or could tell where it had been hid. She then inquired for the place where Christ was crucified, and found it out by the help of the Jews and Christians, or, as Rufinus says, by some revelation; and, being moved by the Holy Spirit, she ordered the buildings to be pulled down, and the rubbish to be removed. The faith of this female saint was recompensed beyond expectation; and upon digging very deep, they found the holy sepulchre, and near it three crosses, with the title which had been affixed to the Cross of Christ, and the nails which had pierced his sacred body. But still a difficulty remained, to distinguish which was the Cross of Christ. Saint *Macarius*, who was Bishop of Jerusalem, proposed the method. He was a prelate illustrious for his wisdom, and truly worthy of God; and he had just then overthrown the heresy of Arius at the great Council of Nice. This

to the Holy Apostolic See, and to the Fathers of the Church; erroneous, and leading to heresy, respectivè. The Archbishop would rather have had this book purged and corrected, but *the evil, as he said, being spread quite through the work,* he judged it more convenient to condemn and suppress it, and forbid the reading of it. The Parliament also suppressed it. But the person of the author was spared, because of his absolute submission to the Ordinance of the Prelate, to whom he presented a declaration upon twelve heads, signed with his own hand; in which he acknowledges that in some points he was mistaken; he explains himself upon the rest, and confesses that he had not well expressed his sentiments, nor sufficiently weighed the terms which he had used. This declaration of Du Pin was printed, together with the decrees of the Archbishop and of the Parliament. I mention not this to hurt the character of his book. On the contrary, I am persuaded that all men of sense, especially amongst the Protestants, will only esteem it so much the more." (*Le Clerc*, Bibl. A. et M. iii. p. 194.)—The *pious ears* of the Archbishop of Paris, and of other good souls, must have been offended at many free things said by Du Pin, and at the account which he gave of Cyril and of the Council of Ephesus. Every intelligent reader will perceive that he had a bad opinion of this Father, and that he thought him an insolent man, and a miserable scribbler. He sets forth very fairly the objections which may be made to the conduct and the proceedings of the saint and of the council; and then he sets himself to remove and invalidate those objections, and gives as good answers to them as could be given. If his defence was unsatisfactory, as it really is, how could he help it? Matters of fact are of a stubborn nature, and it was not in his power to annihilate them. He might indeed have *made history*, in the manner of *Varillas* and *Maimbourg*; and then he would have been in odour of sanctity, and have enjoyed the favour of his superiors. Of *Cyril*, see below.

holy man, knowing that one of the principal ladies of the city lay extremely ill, told Helena, that they must carry the three crosses to the sick person, and beg of God that he would cure her by the application of the true Cross. The Empress and all the people being present, he touched the woman with two of the crosses ineffectually; but as soon as he had made use of the third, she arose in perfect health, and stronger than she had ever been. It is believed, says Sozomen, that they applied the Cross to a dead body which instantly revived. Saint Paulinus and Saint Sulpitius Severus mention only this last miracle.

“Helena, full of joy, adored, not the wood itself, says St. Ambrose, which would have been a Pagan folly, but the King of Heaven who suffered upon it. She took part of this treasure to carry to her son, and inclosing the rest in a silver box, she committed it to the Bishop of Jerusalem. It was carefully kept in the Church which was built there, and the Bishop alone had the power to give little bits of it, which were considered as a singular favour and blessing. Saint Paulinus relates a *very singular thing* concerning that part of the Cross which was at Jerusalem. This Cross, says he, having a vital virtue in an insensible and inanimate substance, has yielded and continues to yield almost daily its precious wood to the desires of an infinite number of persons, without ⁴ suffering any diminution; continuing all the while as if it had been untouched. It permits itself everyday to be divided into several parts, and yet remains exposed entire to the veneration of the people. Saint Cyril of Jerusalem says only that the pieces of the Cross were brought away from Jerusalem, and were spread all over the earth twenty-five years after.”⁵

See more in Tillemont concerning the nails, the title which was upon the cross, the spear, the reed, the sponge, and the crown of thorns; part of which wrought miracles even so lately as in his time.

Here arises some difficulty, not whether the miracles were

⁴ A man capable of affirming a fact so absurd and ridiculous, ought not to be cited and recommended to us as a good witness for miracles; but should be rejected with disdain, at least by Protestant divines. What pity is it that an ingenious, religious, charitable, and good-tempered prelate, as Paulinus was, gave into these godly fictions!

⁵ Tillemont, H. E. vii. 5.

true or false, for as to that, all is clear enough; but whether the discovery of the cross was a fiction made up some years after the death of Helena and of Constantine, or whether Helena really found a cross. This must remain a dubious point, though upon the whole it seems most probable that the story was invented by the Christians of Jerusalem, after the emperor and his mother were dead. The discovery in the time of Constantine rests principally upon the authority of Cyril of Jerusalem, the only witness who lived at that time, and who speaks of no miracles attending the discovery: and the question is whether the Epistle of Cyril, which mentions it, be genuine, or spurious, or interpolated; and also whether Cyril, supposing it genuine, made up that part of the story himself, and dated the discovery too early.

If Helena found a cross, it is impossible now to know how the fraud was conducted, and who were the actors in this godly knavery; the hidiers and the finders. Eusebius who lived then, and was bishop of Cæsarea in the neighbourhood, says not a word of the Cross; though he relates the discovery of the sepulchre of Christ, and mentions the magnificent church which was erected there, and names Macarius, as the person to whom the care of the building was committed.⁶ It is therefore to be concluded that either he knew nothing, or believed nothing of it. If the thing was really transacted as Socrates and others relate, one might conjecture that Eusebius chose to be silent, lest he should offend the family of Constantine, and say what the times would not bear.

“Neque Crucis inventionem solus præterit Eusebius. Quod magis miramur, de ea nihil memorat Constantinus ipse, in sua ad Macarium Epistola, ubi Dei in laudes erumpit, ob repertum, quod tamdiu delituerat, sepulcrum Domini, *sacratissimum passionis ejus monumentum*. Quanto magis repertæ Crucis meminisset? Non nescimus Bellarminum Constantini verba hæc accommodasse Cruci. Sed intoleranda hæc est Bellarmini sive inscitia, sive audacia, quocunque nomine vocetur, dum ex Sepulcro Crucem fabricat. Inventæ Crucis primus mentionem fecit Cyrillus, qui ea de re ad Constantium scripsit Augustum:

⁶ Vit. Const. iii. 25, &c.

Ac tempore quidem Deo dilectissimi ac beatæ memoriæ Constantini patris tui, salutare Crucis lignum Hierosolymis repertum est. Cum autem illo tempore vixerit Cyrillus, quo Hierosolymam lustravit Helena, durum fortasse videbitur, aut factum negare, aut Epistolam Cyrillo detrudere. Non dissimulabimus tamen in ea quæstione nos pendere animi. Urget Cyrilli ad Imperatorem Epistola, qui commentis ludi non debuit. Dubium tamen animum multa faciunt. Primum de reperta Cruce traditionis dissimilitudo. Dein altissimum Eusebii Constantinique de ea inventionem silentium, &c. Denique fraus reliquiariorum nobis est timenda in rebus ejusmodi. Excogitatam esse Crucis inventionem, partim ut pergratum fieret Constantio, qui reliquiis extra modum delectabatur, partim ut Ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ honos accumularetur, quid vetat? Nonne Juvenalis, Cyrilli de successoribus unus, per *commentitia scripta* Palæstinæ principatum extorquere voluit, docente Leone, *Epist.* 62. Hieronymus quidem ⁷ Cyrillum ejusmodi coloribus pingit in *Chronico*, quibus existimari forsitan posset animum a piis fraudibus alienum non gestasse.”⁸ If Cyril of Jerusalem wrote these words, and vouched for the discovery of the true cross, he must, as to this particular, pass either for a *deceiver*, or for

that tool,

Which wise men work with, call'd — .

One would therefore willingly suppose that the letter ascribed to Cyril is spurious or interpolated. The good woman Helena was near fourscore years old, when she took this journey to Jerusalem. It is more probable that she should have been imposed upon, than that she should have had any share in the contrivance. As to Macarius, if what is here related of him be true, his *blessedness* must have been let into the secret. Helena was sainted and highly honoured after her death: her body is said to be in an Abbey in France, and also at Rome; but there is no great inconvenience to suppose it to be in two places at once. The multiplication of the cross, attested by Paulinus, leads us to this opinion.⁹

The Ecclesiastics of Jerusalem, at what time soever they contrived the discovery of the cross, knew their own interest

⁷ See Sozom. iv. 25, vii. 7; Socrat. ii. 40; concerning the character of Cyril.

⁸ S. Basnage, Ann. ii. 728, 729.

⁹ See Tillemont, H. E. vii. 18.

very well. It must have drawn a swarm of pious vagrants to their city, and have brought in great revenues to the church and to the bishop, if they gave only sixpence a piece, to see the box in which the ¹ cross was locked up.

The finding of the cross has been also ascribed to one Judas, a Jew, (and a bad name), by Gregory of Tours.² I know not why Basnage should affirm that this Gregory is the first of those who have spoken of the finding of the cross.³ There is a passage of Eusebius on the Psalms, which has been thought to refer to these miracles.⁴

¹ Macrina, the sister of Gregory Nyssen, carried about her a little cross, and a ring in which a small bit of the true cross was inclosed.—*Vit. Macr.*

² See the remarks of J. Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, vi. 14. 10. p. 1243.

³ *Ibid.* p. 1244.

⁴ “*Montfaucon* conjectures that Eusebius composed this work after the year 327, in which those miracles were wrought, that later authors have recorded concerning the discovery of the cross; and to which Eusebius seems to allude (on Psalm lxxxvii. p. 549), where he speaks of miracles wrought in his time near the sepulchre of Jesus Christ, as also of the Church which was built there by Helena, the mother of Constantine. It was not dedicated till the year 335, so that Eusebius must have composed his Commentary after that year. Yet in the Life of Constantine, where Eusebius speaks of this Church, and describes very particularly and with much pomp the Synod which was held there when the Church was consecrated, he says nothing at all of it, though this was the most proper place to mention it. Montfaucon, however, persuades himself that Eusebius refers to these miracles in his Commentary on the Psalms. But one might as probably conclude that this passage in the Commentary was the interpolation of some copyist, at a time when no scruple was made to add to the writings of the ancients, or to take away from them. If Eusebius had heard anything of these miracles, is it to be supposed that he would have passed them over in a work made on purpose to celebrate Constantine and Helena? Was it an indifferent thing, and of no consequence, in the fourth century, whether mention should be made of the manner in which Helena found the true cross, and distinguished it from those of the thieves? No one will say it, or entertain so poor an opinion of the rhetoric of Eusebius, as to imagine that he could omit such an affair, if he knew it. His silence, therefore, will always be a stronger motive to reject what later authors have said upon this subject, than any argument that can be offered to the contrary, from an allusion which might so easily have been inserted by a forger into the Commentary of Eusebius on the Psalms, to support by his authority a fable invented afterwards.” (Le Clerc. Bibl. A. et M. iv. p. 5.) [In the year 1492, as some labourers were repairing the foundations of the Church of the *Holy Cross* at Rome, they dug up something, which it was found convenient, for the furtherance of the sale of Indulgences, to recommend to the devotion of the faithful, as the original inscription on the Cross of Christ. It is true that the real inscription had been long in the custody of the good Catholics of Toulouse; but his Holiness (Alexander VI.) piously maintained the authenticity of the new discovery; which was followed up, as a matter of course, by the production of the head of the lance which pierced the

9. Amongst the Fathers who assisted at the Nicene Council was *Paphnutius*, a venerable confessor and prelate. He was reported, says Socrates, to have wrought miracles, and indeed one would sooner believe it of him than of most of his contemporaries, since he was eminent both in prudence and in goodness. This historian has transmitted to us a remarkable account of his anti-fanatical wisdom, by which he put a stop to a very absurd decree, which else might have passed in that General Council;—

“*Paphnutius cujusdam urbis in superiori Thebaide fuit Episcopus ; vir adeo pius Deoque carus, ut admiranda ab eo signa ederentur. Huic persecutionis tempore oculus fuerat effossus. Imperator vero hominem magnopere observabat, et frequenter in palatium accersebat, effossumque ejus oculum deosculabatur.— Visum erat Episcopis novam legem inducere, ut quicumque in sacrum ordinem allekti essent, id est, Episcopi, Presbyteri, et Diaconi, ab uxorum, quas, cum laici essent, matrimonii jure sibi sociaverant, concubitu abstinerent. Cumque, hac re in medium proposita, singulorum sententiæ rogarentur, surgens in medio Episcoporum concessu Paphnutius vehementer vociferatus est, non esse imponendum clericis et sacerdotibus grave hoc jugum, honorabiles nuptias et torum immaculatum esse dicens ; ne ex nimia severitate damnum potius inferrent Ecclesiæ. Neque enim omnes ferre posse tam districtæ continentiæ disciplinam ; ac forsitan inde eventurum esse, ut cujusque uxoris castitas minime custodiretur. Castitatem autem vocabat congressum viri cum uxore legitima. Satis esse ut qui in Clerum fuissent adscripti, juxta veterem Ecclesiæ traditionem jam non amplius uxores ducerent : non tamen quemquam sejungendum esse ab ea quam antehac, tunc cum esset laicus, legitime duxisset. Atque hæc dixit, ipse non modo conjugii, sed muliebris congressus penitus expers ; quippe qui a puero in monasterio educatus fuisset, et ob singularem castimoniam ab omnibus celebratus. Cæterum universus sacerdotum cœtus Paphnutii sermonibus assensus est. Proinde omissa ejus rei disceptatione, singulorum*

Redeemer's side. The sponge and the reed were soon forthcoming ; processions were alive ; and money flowed into the coffers of the Holy See with most devout alacrity. It was reported that St. Helena had sent the precious relics to Rome ; and thus the degrading imposition was sanctioned on the one hand, and believed on the other, in the face of all honesty and common sense.—EDIT.]

arbitrio permiserunt, ut ab uxorum consuetudine abstinerent, si vellent.”⁵

Baronius and Valesius would willingly set the account aside, for obvious reasons. Du Pin and Tillemont are more fair and candid.⁶

This decree concerning the marriages of the clergy, even as it was modified by the wise Paphnutius, will seem over-rigid to many; and for these, and several other reasons besides these, it is matter of some wonder how the church was supplied with a sufficient number of Ecclesiastics. Who that loved peace and quiet, and could earn a morsel of bread any other way, would have chosen to travel year after year from Jerusalem to Jericho, from council to council, to live in perpetual disputes, jars, broils, and quarrels, censuring and censured, anathematising and anathematised; and, if he happened to be on the wrong side of the question, sure to be banished and transported at least to some *remote island*, if nothing worse ensued? Who would not say,

Quod te per Genium, dextramque, Deosque Penates
Obsecro, et obtestor; vitæ me redde priori!

10. The Council of *Illiberis* is supposed by some to have been held in the time of Constantine; by others, much earlier; and by Tillemont, about A.D. 300. This Council excommunicated those who lent money upon interest, though the laws of the empire permitted it: but almost all the Fathers had wrong notions about interest, or usury; as also about self-defence, and bearing arms.

Instead of dissuading vows of virginity, it excommunicated those women, who, after having made such rash and silly vows, entered into a state of matrimony. It also excommunicated those who should eat with a Jew.⁷

“The Council of *Illiberis* made two decrees against the Jews of Spain. In that country they had much commerce with the Christians: they ate together, and lived familiarly. The Council forbad this intercourse under pain of excommunication for any one who should eat with a Jew. The punishment was violent and inflicted *mal-à-propos*; since repasts are actions purely

⁵ Socr. i. 11.

⁶ See Lowth on *Socrates*, and Tillemont, H. E. vi. p. 677.

⁷ Tillemont, H. E. vii. 302.

civil, and excommunication ought to be inflicted only for Ecclesiastical offences.—By another decree this council forbids the possessors of lands to permit the Jews to bless the fruits of the earth, because their benediction would render that of the Christians useless; and it threatens to drive out entirely from the Church those who should disobey.—The Jews in that country seem to have been tenants to the Christians. They carried the first fruits to the synagogue, or rather they had public prayers for the divine blessing on their grounds. The Spanish Jews have still in their ritual a benediction which they pronounce for almonds, apricots, cider, and acorns. They request of God, that he would send rain and dew upon the earth, and bless the fruits, seeds, &c. These are the blessings which the Council of Illiberis has condemned. It forbade the landlords to suffer them to be used by the tenants, fearing that the Jewish would cause the Christian benediction to be ineffectual; as if prayers addressed to the same God could prejudice each other, and those of the Jew could have a noxious influence on the petitions of the faithful!"^s

XXX. OF THE EARLY ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIANS.

1. UNDER Constantine flourished EUSEBIUS, the most learned bishop of that age, and the Father of ecclesiastical history, whom it were ingratitude to pass over slightly in a work of this kind. Like the illustrious Origen, of whom he was very fond, he has had warm friends and inveterate enemies, and the world has ever been divided in judging of his theological sentiments:—

Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ ἂν γνολίης, ποτέροισι μετείη,
Ἥ ἐ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὀμιλέος, ἢ μετ' Ἀχαιοῖς.

The *Arians* and *Unitarians* have always laid claim to him, and of their opposers many have given him up, others have defended him; and in truth any party might be glad to have him on their side. In the manuscripts of Eusebius, we find him perpetually censured and reviled in marginal notes by Greek scholiasts, and called *Arian*, *heretic*, *blasphemer*, *detestable wretch*, &c.

He was one of those bishops who judged that Arius had hard

^s Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, vi. 14. 8.

measure, and who wrote a letter in his behalf to Alexander of Alexandria. But he was a bad intercessor upon that occasion, and probably had very little interest with Alexander. He was certainly no admirer of Athanasius, yet not an active and violent adversary. He had the favour and friendship of Constantine, which he seems never to have used in depressing or hurting others, or in getting anything for himself; and he refused to change his bishopric for a better. He scrupled at first to admit the word *ὁμοούσιος*, because it was *unscriptural*; but afterwards, for the sake of peace and quiet, he complied with it in a sense which he gave to it, and which has been mentioned above. *The use of unscriptural terms, saith he, has been the cause of almost all the confusion and disturbance that has happened in the church.*⁹ He seems to have been neither an Arian nor an Athanasian; but one who endeavoured to steer a middle course, yet inclining more to the Arians than to the Athanasians. When he died, Acacius succeeded him in the see of Cæsarea;—a learned man, who had been his disciple, and his intimate friend, and who was of the Semiarian party.¹

Eusebius was very laborious and industrious, and must have spent much time and pains in reading, collecting, and digesting; but he seems to have bestowed little in forming a style, and in imitating the colour, manner, and diction of polite writers. His language is neither elegant nor perspicuous; and, where it aims at eloquence and sublimity, it is usually turgid and perplexed.

Treating of the doctrine of the *Trinity*, he makes this remark:—"Our Saviour has taught us what we ought to think concerning him, in order to obtain salvation: *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him may have life eternal.*"² He says not, he who *knoweth* his nature, but he who *believeth* in him."³

⁹ Ἀγράφους χρῆσασθαι φωναῖς διὸ σχεδὸν ἡ πᾶσα γέγονε σύγχυσις τε καὶ ἀκαταστασία τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν. Apud Socr. i. 8, p. 26.

¹ See a Life of Eusebius by Valesius, and another by Le Clerc, and Le Clerc's Ars Crit. vol. iii., and Bibl. A. et. M. iv. 18; Fabricius, B. G. v. 30; Du Pin, B. E. ii. 1; Beausobre, Hist. de Man. i. 545; Fleury, H. E. xii.; Tillemont, Cave, Montfaucon, and S. Basnage (Ann. ii. 753), who, in his account of the Arian controversy, shows himself more favourable to the Consubstantialists than becomes an impartial historian.

² John iii. 16.

³ Euseb. c. Marc. i. 12, p. 72.

In the *Testimonia pro Eusebio*, collected by Valesius, we find the following censure:—*Meminimus in quodam libello Eusebii, quondam egregii in reliquis viri, legisse, quia nec Spiritus Sanctus sciat mysterium nativitatis Domini nostri Jesu Christi; et admiror tantæ doctrinæ virum hanc maculam Spiritui Sancto inflixisse. Ex Libro Quæst. &c.* The writer of these *Questions* might not perhaps mean Eusebius of *Cæsarea*, but some other Eusebius;⁴ and perhaps he mistook his author, whosoever that author was; who might say that the *Evil Spirit*, the devil, was ignorant of this mystery, as Ignatius affirms in one of his Epistles.

Eusebius compares the three sons of Constantine to the Trinity. Οὕτω δὴ Τριάδος λόγῳ τριτὴν γονὴν παίδων θεοφιλῇ κτησάμενος.⁵ What was become of his judgment and discretion, when he wrote such things!

He observes that Christ left his body for a short space of time, to show that he was really dead; and reassumed it, to manifest his divine power.⁶ See how easy it is to fall into heterodoxy quite unawares! Eusebius thought not of giving offence by making this remark: but some wise *schoolman* hath delivered it as an apophthegm, *Quod Christus assumsit, nunquam dimisit.* And therefore we must bring Eusebius off as well as we can. Let Valesius plead his cause. *Hæc benigna interpretatione adjuvanda sunt*, says he: *Christus enim ne minimo quidem temporis puncto corpus suum reliquit; quippe qui, ut vulgo dici solet, id quod semel assumsit, nunquam dimisit. Sed corpus suum animæ consortio destitui aliquantisper passus est.* An excellent distinction!

Eusebius calls Christ τὸ φῶς τὸ προκόσμιον,⁷ which Valesius translates, *æternum lumen*. He should have rendered it, *antemundanum lumen*, which, though not so elegant, is more exact. Eusebius could have said φῶς αἰδίων, if he had been so minded. He declares that the Son is Πατρὶ συμβασιλεύων ἐξ ἀνάρχων αἰώνων εἰς ἀπείρους καὶ ἀτελευτήτους αἰῶνας, i. e. *reigns with his Father from ages without beginning to ages without end.*⁸ And again:—οὐ χρόνοις μὲν τισιν οὐκ ὄντα, ὕστερον δέ ποτε γεγονότα, ἀλλὰ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων ὄντα, καὶ πρόοντα, καὶ τῷ Πατρὶ ὡς υἱὸν διαπαντὸς

⁴ See Tillemont, H. E. vii. 529.

⁵ Vit. Const. iv. 40.

⁶ Τὸ μὲν σῶμα πρὸς βραχὺ καταλιπών.—*Laud. Const.* xv.

⁷ E. H. i. 2.

⁸ *Laud. Const.* i. p. 719.

συνόντα—That is, *There was not a time when he was not, or when he began to be, but he as Son always coexisted with the Father.*⁹ And, in his *Commentary on the Psalms*:—τί οὖν φησι πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος, Ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε; δηλονότι περὶ τῆς χρονικῆς ἔφη γεννήσεως τῆς κατ' οἰκονομίαν· περὶ γὰρ τῆς ἀνάρχου φησὶν αὐτὸς ὁ Δαυὶδ, Ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε.¹

This looks like an acknowledgment of the *eternity* of the Son, and this was also the opinion of his master Origen; who says, Ὅτε δὲ τὸ, Ὑἱὸς μου εἶ συ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, λέγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ᾧ ἀεὶ ἐστι τὸ σήμερον, οὐκ ἔνι γὰρ ἐσπέρα Θεοῦ, ἐγὼ δὲ ἡγοῦμαι ὅτι οὐδὲ πρωΐα, ἀλλ' ὁ συμπαραεκτείνων τῇ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ αἰδίῳ αὐτοῦ ζώῃ, ἵν' οὕτως εἴπω, χρόνος, ἡμέρα ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σήμερον, ἐν ᾗ γεγέννηται ὁ υἱός· ἀρχῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ οὕτως οὐχ εὕρισκομένης, ὥς οὐδὲ τῆς ἡμέρας.² Origen admitted also the eternity of the world; or of various beings eternally derived from God, and dependent upon him, and owing their existence to his will and power. This opinion was most generally received by the philosophers; and some Christians, perhaps, adopted it. But Origen proposed it rather as a philosophical problem, than as a doctrine.³

Eusebius says, that when the *Word* condescended to become man, his divinity was not impaired by it; but he was everywhere present, filling all things and ruling all things, οὐδὲ ἀποπесῶν τῆς θεότητος.⁴ He observes that all things owe their existence, and their perfections, to the *Word*, and to the *Holy Spirit*; that the *Word* called even the angels into being; and that the *Holy Spirit* at the same time illuminated and sanctified them. Ἀγγέλων γοῦν τὴν μὲν εἰς τὸ εἶναι πάροδον ὁ δημιουργὸς Λόγος, ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων, παρείχετο· τὸν ἁγιασμὸν δὲ αὐτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον συνεπέφερεν.⁵ He says of Christ, ὡσανεὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑπάρχοντα δύναμιν καὶ σοφίαν [ἰσοκλεῆ], καὶ τὰ δευτερεῖα τῆς κατὰ πάντων βασιλείας τε καὶ ἀρχῆς ἐμπεπιστευμένον.⁶ Here Valesius, as a fair and judicious critic, shuts out of the text ἰσοκλεῆ, which was not in his manuscripts, and is a most manifest interpolation; and yet inserts in his translation, *honore ipsi æqualem*,

⁹ Dem. Evang. iv. p. 149.

¹ P. 15.

² Comm. in Joan. p. 31. See more to the same purpose in Huetii *Origeniana*, p. 44, &c.

³ Origeniana, p. 167, &c.

⁴ Dem. Ev. p. 169.

⁵ Com. in Psalm. p. 125.

⁶ E. H. i. 2.

for reasons which one may easily guess. This was what he ought not to have done, and what would deceive several of his readers. I say nothing of *obtinens*, which yet expresses not ἐμπειστευμένον. Ἐμπιστεύομαι is, *I have a thing intrusted and committed to me.*

The passage, τοιαῦτα τῆς Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ παρανομίας τε καὶ δυσσεβείας τὰπίχειρα,⁷ Valesius translates, *Igitur Judæorum scelus atque impietatem adversus Deum Jesum Christum hujusmodi ultio consecuta est.* Eusebius, to be sure, was very willing to call Christ Θεός, and has given him that title a hundred times; but he has not called him so here. He calls him also αὐτόθεον,⁸ that is, *verum Deum*, or *naturā Deum*; not, as Valesius renders it, *per se Deum*. Neither Eusebius, nor indeed any of the Nicene Fathers, would have called Christ αὐτόθεον, in the sense of *self-existing*, or *first cause*. Elsewhere he writes:—Οὐδὲ δύο θεοὺς ἀνάγκη δοῦναι τὸν τὰς δύο ὑποστάσεις τιθέντα· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἰσοτίμους αὐτὰς ὀρίζομεθα, οὐδ' ἄμφω ἀνάρχους καὶ ἀγεννήτους· ἀλλὰ μίαν μὲν, τὴν ἀγέννητον καὶ ἀναρχον· θατέραν δὲ γεννητὴν, καὶ ἀρχὴν τὸν πατέρα κεκτημένην. Διὸ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς, καὶ ἑαυτοῦ εἶναι θεὸν τὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα διδάσκει, ἐν οἷς φησι, Ἀνέρχομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν, καὶ Θεὸν μου καὶ Θεὸν ὑμῶν.—Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς, ὅτε μὲν αὐτὸς παραβάλλεται τῷ πατρὶ, οὐκ ἔτ' ἔσται καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς Θεός, ἀλλ' υἱὸς μονογενὴς καὶ ἀγαπητὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, καὶ ἀπαύγασμα τῆς πατρικῆς δόξης· σέβει τε καὶ προσκυνεῖ καὶ δοξάζει τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πατέρα, Θεὸν αὐτὸν καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιγραφόμενος.⁹ Thus rendered by Dr. Clarke:—"It is not necessary that he who acknowledges the Father and the Son to be two distinct subsistencies, should say that there are two Gods: for we do not look upon them as two co-ordinate persons, both of them underived and unbegotten; but one unbegotten and underived, the other begotten and derived from the Father. Wherefore the Son also himself teaches us, that his Father is even *his* God also, [as well as ours;] when he says, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, unto *my* God and *your* God. But now on the other side, the Son, when he is compared with the Father, cannot be said to be the God of his Father, but his only-begotten and beloved Son, and the *image* of the invisible

⁷ H. E. iii. 6.

⁸ Ib. x. 4. See the notes there.

⁹ De Eccl. Theol. xi. 7.

God, and the *brightness* of his Father's glory ; and honours and worships and glorifies his Father, calling him even *his* God also, [as well as *ours*.]"¹

Again, he says of Christ, *πρωτέοις μὲν τῆς τῶν ὅλων ἀρχῆς, ἰσοῖς δὲ τῆς πατρικῆς βασιλείας ἐνδοξαζόμενος*.² Here Valesius translates the text as it stands in the copies, for which he is not to be blamed, and, as a fair commentator, observes in his notes that *ἰσοῖς* must have been thrust in by some transcriber, and that Eusebius wrote *δευτερεοῖς*. *In gubernatione quidem universi Filium ait principem locum obtinere : in regno autem Patris secundum*. The emendation is unquestionably right, and the reasons which Valesius gives for it are unanswerable. It is not the business of a critic, or an editor, to make his author more or less orthodox than he was. In Socrates,³ Valesius has twice *Deum et Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum*, where there is no *Deum* in the text, and where they who speak are Arian bishops.

Eusebius : Ἦδη γοῦν ὅλην Χριστιανῶν πολίχνην αὐτανδρον ἀμφὶ τὴν Φρυγίαν ἐν κύκλῳ περιβαλόντες ὀπλίται, πῦρ τε ὑφάψαντες, κατέφλεξαν αὐτοὺς ἅμα νηπίοις καὶ γυναιξὶ, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιβοωμένους.⁴ The phrase, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν Χριστὸν, is very remarkable ; but as it is a manner of speaking which Eusebius has never used in any other place, and which he has expressly condemned, I believe it should be, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν ΚΑΙ Χριστὸν ἐπιβοωμένους, or, ΚΑΙ ΤΟΝ Χριστόν.⁵ These are not words taken down by some by-stander, but the expressions of the historian, describing Christian martyrs, men, women, and children, all praying and dying together ; and therefore we must expect to find the usual language and style of Eusebius.⁶

¹ Christus Eusebio dicitur αὐτόθεος, ipse Deus, et ἀληθινὸς Θεός, verus Deus, scilicet comparate ad homines, qui aliquando dii appellantur : nam comparate ad Patrem, sive Deum universorum, non vere et proprie Deus dicitur, secundum Eusebii sententiam. Ait Filium πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων et πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων, id est, ante sæcula productum : nam sæcula et tempus omne cum mundo cœpisse cum multis aliis veteribus arbitratur, nec vox αἰώνιος apud Eusebium pro æternitate ante creationem usquam sumitur : nam hujusmodi æternitatem in Filio evidenter negat.—Montfaucon, *Prælim. ad Euseb. in Psalmos*, p. 24.

² Laud. Const. i. p. 719.

³ E. H. ii. 37.

⁴ E. H. viii. 11.

⁵ As *De Mart. Pal.* viii.—τὸν τῶν ὅλων Θεόν, ΚΑΙ τὸν Χριστὸν ὁμολογήσαντας. *Ib.* i. μόνου ἑνα Θεόν, ΚΑΙ μόνον Χριστὸν βασιλέα Ἰησοῦν ὁμολογήσαντες. viii. 10. τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα πρὸς τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεόν καθαρῶς τείναντες—τὸν μὲν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. And in many other places which it is needless to cite.

⁶ See Dr. Clarke, *Script. Doct.* No. 539, who says, "All which, by the way, clearly

Eusebius says of the Λόγος:—τῇ τοῦ Πατρὸς καθωσιώμενος τιμῇ. *Male interpres vertit, dignitatis paternæ particeps, cum vertendum esset, devotus ac dicatus cultui Patris. Similis est inscriptio illa, quæ in basi statuarum quas, imperatoribus dicaverant, vulgo legitur, DEVOTUS NUMINI MAJESTATIQUE EJUS. Cæterum hæc Arianum dogma sapiunt.* So Valesius, who translates the place rightly.

Laud. Const. vi. p. 729. Ἐνθένδε οὖν τῷ τοῦ παντὸς ἐνιαυτοῦ κύκλῳ, τοιαῖσδε σοφίας ἡνίαις ὁ μέγας βασιλεὺς ᾧδε περιδησάμενος τὸν αὐτοῦ αἰῶνα, ὑπὸ MEIZONI φέρεσθαι διετάξατο κυβερνήτῃ, τῷ αὐτοῦ μονογενεῖ λόγῳ, τῷ δὲ κοινῷ τῶν ὅλων σωτήρι, τὰς τοῦ παντὸς παραδοὺς ἡνίας. Where Valesius says;—*Majorem appellat Filium, non quidem ipso Patre, sed reliquis omnibus majorem intelligens. Ac fortasse suspicetur quispiam ab Eusebio scriptum esse ὑπὸ μείωνι.* It is possible that μείζονι is the interpolation of some transcriber, who was offended at the word μείωνι; but yet Eusebius might have said μείζονι, in the sense given to it by Valesius; and therefore it is not necessary to alter the text.

E. H. vii. 19. Τὸν γὰρ Ἰακώβου θρόνον, εἰς δεῦρο πεφυλαγμένον, οἱ τῇδε κατὰ διαδοχὴν περιέποντες ἀδελφοὶ, i. e. *magna prosequuntur reverentia.* Here Valesius, in reverence to this old elbow-chair, and to holy relics, chose rather to increase than to lessen the force of the expression περιέποντες. Περιέπειν is, *to take good care of anything, diligenter custodire et curare.*

Eusebius, in his first book against Marcellus, makes mention of the Trinity, calling the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ μακαρίαν καὶ μυστικὴν Τριάδα, *the holy, and blessed, and mystical Trinity.*⁷ Clemens Alexandrinus also says, τὴν ἁγίαν Τριάδα;⁸ and Origen,⁹ προσκυνητὴν Τριάδα. It has been observed that Theophilus Antiochenus, who lived in the second century, shows that the single passage in Eusebius's account of the Phrygian Martyrs, who are represented as invoking Christ, τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεόν, *the God over all*, must needs have been interpolated with the word *Christ*; as being directly contrary to Eusebius's whole writings, in a point which he has particularly and largely considered." I agree with him, that the place wants emendation, but I think my conjecture is much more probable. Laud. Const. i. Τὴν Χριστοῦ βασιλείαν ὁμολογοῦσι—πρὸς τὸν Κύριον γενομένους. Valesius: *regnum Dei confitentes—cum ad Deum pervenissent.* De Mart. Pal. vii. He should have translated it, *Christi, and Dominum.*

⁷ So likewise, in his Epistle to Flaccillus, p. 57, and in the *Præp. Evang.* xi.

⁸ Apud Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* xiii. 13.

⁹ Tom. vi. in Joan.

century, is the first in whose writings the word *Trinity* is used for the Father, Son, and Spirit. Αἱ τρεῖς ἡμέραι—τύποι εἰς τῆς Τριάδος, τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Λόγου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς Σοφίας αὐτοῦ.¹

Eusebius censures Marcellus for teaching that the body of Jesus Christ should cease to exist after the day of judgment. This is a question which, methinks, neither Marcellus nor Eusebius should have pretended to meddle with, and to decide.

Le Clerc writes :—"Father Simon has made some remarks upon the *Præparatio* and the *Demonstratio Evangelica* of Eusebius, and upon the editions which we have of those books.² He

¹ Ad Autol. ii. 15.

² The *Præparatio* and the *Demonstratio Evangelica* of Eusebius are, like the rest of his works, useful and valuable treatises, and deserve a better edition ; especially the former, in which are preserved many curious fragments of ancient writers. It is, says Fabricius, "collectio pulcherrima argumentorum, variorumque notatu dignissimorum monumentorum ac testimoniorum, ex scriptoribus externis magnam partem hodie deperditis, qua animus lectoris præparetur ad demonstrationes de veritate Evangelii Christi, ex sacris literis tanto facilius imbibendas admittendasque." —III. 41. Mercury says, Ὅς δ' ἐγὼ, ὃν καλέεις, Ζηνὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱὸς, Ἑρμῆς προβέβηκα, λιπὼν ἀστραῖον ἀνακτα. Vigerus reads, Ἑρμῆς ὅς— Perhaps, ὦ Δ' ἐγὼ, ὃν καλέεις, Ζηνὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱὸς, ἙΡΜΕΙΑΣ προβέβηκα— Observe that in these oracles the gods themselves are supposed to speak.—V. 7. An oracle of *Apollo Didymæus* begins thus :—Μητέρι μὲν μακάρων μέλεται Τιτήνιδι Πείη Αὐλοῖ, καὶ τυμπάνων πάταγοι, καὶ θῆλυς ὄμιλος. *Apollo* stole this from the hymn in *Matrem Deorum*, which is called *Homer's* :—Ἡ κροτάλων, τυπάνων τ' ἰαχῇ, σὺν τε τρόμος αὐλῶν Εὐαδεν. In the oracle we ought to read, not τυμπάνων with a vowel made short before μπ, but τυπάνων, as in the Hymn to *Cybele*, τυπάνων τ' ἰαχῇ, with *Barnes* and others. So in the *Atys* of *Catullus*, v. 8 : *Niveis citata cepit manibus leve typanum*, *Typanum tubam Cybelle, tua, Mater, initia*. *Apol. Rh. I.* Ῥόμβῳ καὶ ΤΥΠΑΝΩ Πείην Φρύγες ἰλάσκονται. The rule is this :—when a vowel is made short before two consonants, those consonants must be such as can begin a syllable, as κυ-κνος, &c. If any poets have violated this rule, of which there are some instances, it is a fault in them, and no examples can justify it. Θῆλυς ὄμιλος, in the oracle, which *Vigerus* renders *catus fœmineus*, is *grex semivirorum*, the *Galli*, the castrated priests or servants of *Cybele* ; who were vagabonds, thieves, beggars, and most infamous wretches. The priests of *Isis*, etc., used to carry their deities about to ask alms ; upon which *Tertullian* says very prettily, that the Christians could not afford to relieve begging men and begging gods too : *Non enim sufficimus et hominibus et Diis vestris mendicantibus opem ferre* (*Apol. c. 42*). *Van Dale* would distinguish between the *Galli* and the *Priests* of this goddess ; and supposes the *Galli* to have been rascals of a lower rank. —V. 8. An Oracle of *Hecate* :—Ἡέριον μετὰ φέγγος ἀπείριτον, ἀστεροπληθές, Ἀχραντον πολὺ δῶμα θεοῦ λίπον ἢ δ' ἐπιβαίνω Γαίης ζωτρόφοιο τεῆς ὑποθημοσύνησι, Πειθοῖ τ' ἀρρήτων ἐπέων, οἷς δὴ φρένα τέρπει Ἀθανάτων ἀδαῇ θνητὸς βροτός. *Quid si μέγα φέγγος*, says a friend of mine. Perhaps it should be thus :—Ἡέριον ΚΑΤΑ φέγγος ἀπείριτον, ἀστεροπληθές, Ἀχραντον πολὺ δῶμα ΘΕΩΝ λίπον, ἩΔ' ἐπιβαίνω Γαίης ζωτρόφοιο, τεῆς ὑποθημοσύνησι, Πειθοῖ τ' ἀρρήτων ἐπέων, οἷς δὴ φρένα ΤΕΡΠΕΙΝ Ἀθανάτων ΕΔΑΗ θνητὸς βροτός. *Vigerus* corrects κατὰ and τέρπειν. The rest is mine, θεῶν for θεοῦ, ἢδ' for

commends the edition of the *Præparatio* by Vigerus the Jesuit, which indeed is the best and the most faithful.³ Yet there are

ἡ δ', ἐδάη, *novit*, for ἀδαῆ. Vigerus conjectures ἐάδε, *placuit*; which is wrong, and makes a barbarism in the construction. It should be translated: — *quæis pectora divûm Mortalis mulcere potest.*—V. 23. Enomaus complains that when he himself consulted Apollo on some very important affair, and desired his direction, he received this impertinent answer:—Ἐκ τανυστρόφοιο λάας σφενδόνης ἰεὺς ἀνὴρ, χῆνας ἐνάριζε βουλαῖσιν ἀσπέτους, ποιηβόρους. There is no occasion to make Apollo talk more foolishly than he did; therefore we will try to mend his discourse a little. Vigerus, the editor of Eusebius, did not perceive that these were Trochaics, and that instead of βουλαῖσιν, *consiliis*, it should be βολαῖσιν, *ictibus*:—Ἐκ τανυστρόφοιο λάας σφενδόνης ἰεὺς, ἀνὴρ, Χῆνας ἐνάριζε βολαῖσιν ἀσπέτους, ποιηβόρους. For the sake of metre, we may read ἐναρίζου, from ἐναρίζομαι; or ἐνάρισον, from ἐναρίζω; or, which is better, ἐναρίζειν, *interficere*, by way of ellipsis, with *incipere, conare*, or some such verb understood. By this most ridiculous oracle, Enomaus was advised to *go and kill geese, by flinging stones at them out of a sling*. By a certain anomaly and irregularity, the Greeks sometimes put the infinitive for the imperative. “Alia est phrasis apud Græcos usitatissima, cujus exemplum est apud Herod. iv. 163. σὺ μὲν τοι ἥσυχος εἶναι κατελθὼν εἰς τὴν σεωῦτου, ubi *infinitivus* est loco *imperativi*. Sic et apud Homerum, Il. i. 255. σὺ δὲ μεγαλήτορα θυμὸν Ἴσχειν ἐν στήθεσσι. Vide et v. 281. Non potest subaudiri δεῖ, *oportet*, quod alioqui subaudiri in ea phrasi solet; quia antecessit σὺ, *tu*. Ne dixeris etiam subaudiendum μέμνησο, *memento*; nam apud Hesiodum in hoc versu, ubi hæc ipsa est loquutio, verbum hoc intelligi nequit, Op. D. 616. ἀρότου μεμνημένος εἶναι ὥραλου, *Memor esse arationis tempestivæ*, nemo enim dixerit *memento memor esse*. Vide vv. 623, 641.” (Clericus Art. Crit. T. i. p. 252). But I believe that Le Clerc is a little mistaken, and that all these *anomalies* of the Greek language are *elliptical* forms of speech, and capable of being supplied one way or other; and in Hesiod, though you cannot say, *remember to remember*, μέμνησο μεμνημένος εἶναι, yet you may say, *take care to remember*, φυλάττου μεμνημένος εἶναι. As we are upon the subject of *Oracles*, I shall produce two from *Socrates* the historian, which want emendation (H. E. iii. 23, p. 204). 1. The Rhodians, being under some calamity, and consulting an Oracle, received this answer:—Ἄττιν ἰλάσκεσθαι, θεὸν μέγαν, ἀγνὸν Ἀδωνιν, Εὐβιον, ὀλβιόδωρον, εὐπλόκαμον Διόνυσον. I wonder how Valesius could let such lines pass uncorrected. This *Atys* is so differently spelt and declined, that we cannot determine whether it should be Ἀτην, or Ἀττιν, or Ἀττιν, or Ἀτυν, or Ἀττυν, or something else. We may read: Ἀτην ἸΛΑΣΚΕΣΘΕ, θεὸν μέγαν, ἀγνὸν Ἀδωνιν. 2. The *Delphic Oracle*, in complaisance to Alexander the Great, made him a god:—Ζῆνα θεῶν ὑπατον, καὶ Ἀθηναῖαν Τριτογένειαν Τιμᾶτε βροτέων ἐν σώματι κρυπτὸν ἄνακτα, Ὅν Ζεὺς ἀρίσταῖς γοναῖς ἔσπειρεν ἀρωγὸν Εὐνομίης θνητοῖσιν Ἀλέξανδρον βασιλῆα. Worship, said the priestess, Jupiter, and his daughter Minerva, and his son Alexander. It should be: Ζῆνα θεῶν ὑπατον, καὶ Ἀθηναῖαν Τριτογένειαν Τιμᾶτε, ΒΡΟΤΕΩΝ Τ' ἐν σώματι κρυπτὸν ἄνακτα, Ὅν Ζεὺς ἈΡΡΗΤΟΙΣΙ γοναῖς ἔσπειρεν, κ. τ. λ. Ἀρρήτοις is the emendation of Valesius.—In Book IX. Eusebius has inserted several lines of a miserable Jewish bard, called

³ The best edition of the *Præparatio* is that of *Professor Gaisford*, from the Oxford Press, which has also sent forth a yet more valuable edition, if possible, of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, under the superintendence of the late *Professor Burton*. To these the *History of Socrates* has lately been added, after the recension of *Valesius*.—
EDIT.

some passages where this translator softens the Arianism of Eusebius.⁴ The *Demonstratio* is not so well translated, and it is

Ezechiel Tragicus, which deserved not the honour of being transcribed. Clemens Alexandrinus has also regaled his readers with some of them (Strom. i. p. 414), and Fabricius gives an account of this Ezechiel (Bibl. Gr. i. p. 679). His verses are very faulty, either through his own ignorance and stupidity, or from injuries done to him by the librarians. Many of the lines might easily be mended; but upon such an author the labour would be ill bestowed. *In scouring an ass's head*, says somebody, *nothing is lost, except soap and pains*. But soap and pains are too good to be thrown away. Gentianus Hervetus thought him an elegant poet. De La Monnoye, a man of better taste, speaks of him with the contempt which he deserves, and supposes that he wrote in the first or second century. Huetius places him a hundred years at least before Christ. It is no great matter when he lived; but I should imagine him to be at least a hundred years older than Clemens Alexandrinus, who cites him, and who flourished towards the end of the second century. (See Baillet, Jug. des Savans, T. iv.)—X. 10: Κατακλυσμοί τε, καὶ ἐκπυρώσεις, Προμηθεὺς, Ἰὼ, Εὐρώπη, Σπαρτοί, Κόρης ἀρπαγή, κ. τ. λ. They are the words of Africanus, who is speaking of the Greek Mythology. Σπαρτοί. *Supplendum credo vel ὀδόντες, vel στρατιῶται, vel aliquid simile. Omnino enim post Europam, de Cadmo, Cadmique militibus ex Draconis dentibus repente satis, locutus videtur.* So Vigerus, who saw the meaning of the place, but was mistaken in thinking that it wanted emendation; for the soldiers who sprang from the Dragon's teeth are called Σπαρτοί by the Greeks, and *Sparti* by the Latins. See Hyginus, Fab. 178, and Munker.—XI. 31. Eusebius, and the Fathers in general, were of opinion that Plato borrowed several things from Moses and the Prophets; but the proofs which they produce are usually by no means conclusive and satisfactory. He says here:—Τῆς Ἑβραίων γραφῆς ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ δημιουργημάτων ἐπιφωνούσης, Καὶ εἶδεν ὁ Θεὸς, ὅτι καλόν· καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ πάντων συγκεφαλαιώσει φασκούσης, Καὶ εἶδεν ὁ Θεὸς τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἰδοὺ, καλὰ λίαν ἤκουε τοῦ Πλάτωνος λέγοντος, Εἰ μὲν δὴ καλὸς ἐστὶν ὁδε ὁ κόσμος, ὃ τε δημιουργὸς ἀγαθός, δῆλον ὡς πρὸς τὸ αἰδίων ἔβλεπε. Καὶ πάλιν, Ὁ μὲν γὰρ κάλλιστος τῶν γεγονότων, ὁ δ' ἄριστος τῶν αἰτίων. Surely a pagan philosopher might say that the world was “the fairest offspring of the fairest mind,” without having seen the Books of Moses. Eusebius might have produced a passage more remarkable, and more to his purpose, from Plato's *Timæus* (p. 37), where it is said, that when God saw the world, which he had made, begin to live and move, he was greatly pleased. Ὡς δὲ κινηθέν τε αὐτὸ καὶ ζῶν ἐνενόησε τῶν αἰδίων θεῶν γεγονὸς ἄγαλμα ὁ γεννήσας Πατήρ, ἠγάσθη τε καὶ εὐφρανθεὶς, κ. τ. λ. To which we may add the fable of Jupiter, mentioned by some mythologist, that when he was born, he laughed for seven days together. Socrates, in the *Phædo*, relates μῦθον καλόν, an elegant history, concerning an Earth altogether resplendent and beautiful, adorned with the brightest colours, whose rocks and solid parts were all precious stones, and exhibited σάρδιά τε καὶ ἰάσπιδας καὶ σμαράγδους. Eusebius might have also compared this narrative with Isaiah liv. 11. “I will lay thy stones with fair colours, and thy foundations with sapphires, and will make thy gates of carbuncles.” Ezekiel xxviii. 13. “In Eden, the garden of God, every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and diamond, the sapphire, the jasper,” &c. Whence Tobit says (xiii. 16.), that Jerusalem should be built with “sapphires, emeralds, precious stones;” and St. John (Rev. xxi. 10, 11.) saw her descend from

⁴ See Lib. vii. 12, and compare this version with the original.

by another hand, by Donatus of Verona, who has accommodated Eusebius to his own notions; of which disingenuity a specimen may be seen in the argument, where Eusebius says, word for word, *that the same prophet (in Psalm cix.) acknowledges clearly two Lords: the one who is the first and the supreme God; the second whom he himself calls his Lord.* The Latin interpreter, instead of this, translates, *that the prophet evidently twice acknowledges the Lord: once when he speaks of him who is God and Father; and secondly, when he speaks of him whom he himself calls his Lord.* In the Greek it is:—*δύο κυρίους ἐμφανῶς ὁμολογεῖ ἓνα, τὸν πρῶτον καὶ ἀνωτάτω Θεὸν· δεύτερον, ὃν αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ ἀναγορεύει Κύριον.*⁵ Eusebius endeavours afterwards to prove this doctrine, in his books of *Ecclesiastical Theology*, against Marcellus of Ancyra, who was, if we consider it well, very nearly of the same sentiments which Christians at present entertain. I am surprised that there should be persons who pretend to deny that Eusebius was an *Arian*, if they have perused those books. It would be an insincerity, which would

heaven, thus adorned with every precious stone. And yet I would not venture to affirm that Plato was acquainted with the Scriptures, but leave it as a moot point.—XV. 22. We have here a Dissertation of *Plotinus*, in which that philosopher proves very well, that the soul is an immaterial, simple, indivisible substance.—XV. 62. After an account of the various disagreeing opinions of the learned pagans, Eusebius concludes with some lines of Timon Phliasius, who wrote satires called *Silli*, in which he ridiculed the vain and violent contentions of the philosophers. These poems were a species of the burlesque, and consisted of verses taken from Homer, and, with small alterations, accommodated and applied to the subject. Τίς γὰρ τοῦσδ' ὁλοῇ ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι; Ἥχους σύνδρομος ὕχλος· ὁ γὰρ, σιωπῶσι χολωθείς, Νούσον ἐπ' ἀνέρας ὤρσε λάλην, ὀλέκοντο δὲ πολλοί. * * * Φοιτᾷ δὲ βροτολοιγὸς Ἔρις κενὸν λελακῦια, Νείκης ἀνδροφόνιο κασιγνήτη καὶ ἔριτος, ἥ τ' ἀλαῇ περὶ πάντα κυλίνδεται· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα Ἔς βρίθος ἐστήριξε κάρη, καὶ ἐς ἐλπίδα βάλλει. These verses are also to be found in Clem. Alex. Strom. v. p. 651, with some variations. In v. 2. the first and second syllables of σιωπῶσι coalesce: in Clemens, σιγῶσι. V. 4, Φοιτᾷ. Perhaps Φοίτα; but the present tense may be right. For κενὸν, read κενεὸν from Clemens. Here λελακῦια has the second syllable short: Hesiod has Δαιμονίη, τί λέλακας; with the second syllable long (Oper. & D. 207). V. 5, ἔριτος. In Clemens ἔριδος. At least, it should be ἔριστος. But this, though it mends the verse, will not mend the bad sense; for how can Ἔρις be the sister of herself? Perhaps, Νείκης ἀνδροφόνιο κασιγνήτη καὶ ἐταίρῃ. So in Homer, Il. Δ. 441. Ἄρεος ἀνδροφόνιο κασιγνήτη, ἐτάρῃ τε. If the rest was like this specimen, the loss of it is not to be regretted. In this sort of wit, in *parodies*, the moderns have infinitely surpassed the ancients, who have, I think, only *one* ingenious poem of this kind; but that poem has a fault which spoils all its beauties, and is scandalously obscene. It is no matter whose it is, or where it is to be found. ⁵ Dem. Ev. v. 3.

give one a very bad opinion of their probity. I had rather believe that they never examined those books, or never in the original.”⁶

It is true that in a multitude of places he establishes the pre-eminence of the Father;⁷ but in other respects he endeavoured to set the dignity of the Λόγος very high, as it appears from the expressions which I have cited, and I gathered as many as I could find. The passages in Eusebius which Le Clerc produces, to show that he was an Arian, are these:—Οὐ γὰρ συνυπάρχειν φαμέν τὸν Ὑιὸν τῷ Πατρὶ, προϋπάρχειν δὲ τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ Ὑιοῦ· εἰ γὰρ συνυπάρχωσι, πῶς ἔσται ὁ Πατὴρ πατήρ, καὶ ὁ Ὑιὸς υἱός; ἢ πῶς ὁ μὲν πρῶτος, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος; ὁ μὲν ἀγέννητος, ὁ δὲ γεννητός; δύο γὰρ, ἐξ ἴσου ὁμοίως ἀλλήλοις συνυπάρχοντα, ἰσότημα ἂν νοοῖντο· καὶ ἦτοι ἄμφω, ὡς ἔφην, ἀγέννητα, ἢ ἐκάτερα γεννητά. Ἄλλ’ οὐδέτερον τούτων ἀληθές· οὔτε γὰρ τὸ ἀγέννητον, οὔτε τὸ γεννητὸν ἂν εἴη· ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον καὶ κρεῖττον καὶ τάξει καὶ τιμῇ τοῦ δευτέρου ἡγεῖται, ὡς ἂν καὶ τοῦ εἶναι, καὶ τοῦ τοιῶσδε εἶναι, τῷ δευτέρῳ αἴτιον γεγεννημένον. Eusebius goes on:—Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ καὶ μόνον ἀληθινὸν εἶναι διδάσκει δι’ ὧν φησιν, Ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεόν· οὐχὶ ὡς ἑνὸς ὄντος μόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἑνὸς ὄντος μόνου ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ, μετὰ προσθήκης ἀναγκαιοτάτης τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ. Ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς Θεὸς μὲν ὁ Ὑιὸς, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἀληθινὸς Θεός· εἰς γὰρ ἔστι καὶ μόνος ἀληθινὸς Θεός, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν πρὸ αὐτοῦ τινά. Εἰ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Ὑιὸς ἀληθινὸς, ἀλλ’ ὡς εἰκὼν τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ εἴη ἂν καὶ Θεός· ἐπεὶ καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος, οὐ μὲν ὡς ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς Θεός.⁸ In his epistle to Alexander of Alexandria, in behalf of the Arians, he says:—Καὶ κατηγορεῖ αὐτῶν τὰ γράμματα, ὡς λεγόντων, ὅτι ὁ Ὑιὸς ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος γέγονεν ὡς εἰς τῶν πάντων. Οἱ δὲ προήνεγκαν ἑαυτῶν γραμματεῖον, ὃ πρὸς σε πεποιήκασιν, ἐν ᾧ τὴν ἑαυτῶν πίστιν ἐκθέμενοι αὐτοῖς ῥήμασι τάδε ὡμολόγουν· τοῦ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης Θεὸν γεννήσαντα Ὑιὸν μονογενῆ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, δι’ οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας καὶ τὰ πάντα πεποίηκε, γεννήσαντα δὲ οὐ δοκήσει, ἀλλὰ ἀληθεῖα ὑποστήσαντα ἰδίῳ θελήματι ἄτρεπτον καὶ ἀναλλοίωτον, ΚΤΙΣΜΑ τοῦ Θεοῦ τέλειον, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῶν κτισμάτων. Εἰ δὲ οὖν τὰ παρ’ αὐτῶν γράμματα ἀληθεύει, πάντως δὴ παρὰ

⁶ Le Clerc, Bibl. A. et M. i. 169.

⁷ In which he followed Origen, who declared himself of this opinion on all occasions. See the *Origeniana* of Huetius. *Inter Christianos Doctores, qui ante Nicænam floruerunt Synodum, multi de Trinitatis mysterio parum caute locuti sunt* (p. 36). Petavius says the same.

⁸ Epist. ad Euphrat.

σοὶ φέρεται, ἐν ᾧ ὁμολογοῦσι τὸν Ὑιὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας πεποίηκεν, εἶναι ἄτρεπτον, καὶ κτίσμα τοῦ Θεοῦ τέλειον, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῶν κτισμάτων. Ἡ δὲ σὴ ἐπιστολὴ κατηγορεῖ αὐτῶν ὡς ἂν λεγόντων ὅτι ὁ Ὑιος γέγονεν ὡς ἐν τῶν κτισμάτων αὐτῶν τοῦτο μὴ λεγόντων, ἀλλὰ σαφῶς διορισμένων ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῶν κτισμάτων. Ὅρα εἰ μὴ εὐθὺς πάλιν αὐτοῖς ἀφορμὴ δίδοται εἰς τὸ ἐπιλαβέσθαι καὶ διαβάλλειν ὁρμᾶσθαι ὅσα καὶ θέλουσι. Πάλιν αὐτοὺς ἡτιῶ λέγοντας ὅτι ὁ ὦν τὸν μὴ ὄντα ἐγέννησε. Θαυμάζω δὲ εἰ δύναται τις ἄλλως εἰπεῖν. Εἰ γὰρ εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ὦν, δῆλον ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ γέγονε πᾶν ὅτι καὶ ἔστι μετ' αὐτόν· εἰ δὲ μὴ μόνος αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ὦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ὑιὸς ἦν ὁ ὦν, καὶ πῶς τὸν ὄντα ὁ ὦν ἐγέννησεν; Οὕτως γὰρ ἂν δύο εἴη τὰ ὄντα. Eusebius says, 'Ο ὦΝ τὸν ΜΗ ὄΝΤΑ ἐγέννησε, with the Arians. The question is, what he means by 'Ο ὦΝ, whether the *self-existing*, or the *eternal*. If he means the *eternal*, he denies the *past eternity* of the Son; if only the *self-existing*, he only denies his *self-existence*.

Le Clerc charges him with shuffling in this controversy, and screening his Arianism under ambiguities: but why had not Eusebius as good a right to interpret the ὁμοούσιος for himself, as Athanasius, or Alexander, or other persons had, to put their sense upon it? The disputants were engaged in a *νυκτομαχία*, a *night-skirmish*, as Socrates justly calls it; and Eusebius seems to have been willing to comply with the Consubstantialists as far as he could, and to interpret the Nicene Creed in such a manner, as to make it acceptable to the Arians; and the difference, at that time, between the two parties was of such a kind, that it was not easy to be exactly determined.

Le Clerc had a dispute with Cave, whom he charged with writing the lives of the Fathers like a panegyrist, and not as an impartial historian; and with vindicating the orthodoxy of Eusebius, who, as Cave said, was a Consubstantialist, and, as Le Clerc affirmed, was an Arian. Amongst other things, Le Clerc complains that certain divines were far more favourable to the ancient fathers than to modern writers, and would excuse in the former what they would condemn in the latter; and in this there was too much truth. If any one had said to those patrons of Eusebius, "You affirm that Eusebius was orthodox, and I grant it: will you then permit me to use the same language, and to speak upon the subject as he did?" certain I am that he could

not have obtained their consent, or escaped their severest censures and indignation.

“Although Eusebius made no difficulty to acknowledge in the Nicene council that the Son of God was before all ages; and clearly rejected the impiety of Arius, who said that he was made out of nothing, and that there was a time when *he was not*: yet was he very unwilling to admit the word *Consubstantial*, that is, to acknowledge that the Son is of the same substance with the Father; and when he assented to this word, he gave it a sense which will not establish the coëquality of the Son, since in a letter which he wrote to his own church to give them an account of his conduct, he speaks thus:—*When it is said that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, the meaning is only that the Son has no resemblance to the creatures which were made by him, but has a perfect resemblance to his Father, of whom he was begotten, and not from any other hypostasis or substance.*—If one might justify Eusebius concerning the divinity of the Son, yet it would be difficult to defend his notions concerning the Holy Ghost: for in his *Præparatio*, and *Demonstratio*, and *Ecclesiastical Theology*, he affirms that he is not truly God. *The Holy Spirit*, says he, *is neither God, nor Son of God, because he has not his origin from the Father, like the Son, but is of the number of the things which have been made by the Son.* This shows that Socrates, Sozomen, and some modern writers, have in vain endeavoured to excuse him entirely; and, on the other hand, that it is a great injustice to call him Arian, and head of the Arians, as Jerome has done. Eusebius was not author of any new Formularies of Faith; he conducted no intrigues to ruin Athanasius and his partisans; he would much rather have been instrumental in pacifying and reuniting the two parties.—I doubt not but that his many amiable qualities caused him to be set down in the number of saints in some ancient martyrologies. It is true that he has not remained in quiet possession of this title: but in my opinion, it were a temerity to judge him absolutely unworthy of it.”^a

Eusebius testifies that in his time there were some slender remains of miraculous gifts and powers. Speaking of the miracles of Christ, believed by Christians upon sufficient evidence, he adds:—ἐξήτασται παρ’ ἡμῶν καὶ βεβασάνισται καὶ δι’ ἐτέρων

^a Du Pin.

πραγμάτων ἐναργῶν, δι' ὧν αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν, οἷς ἂν κρίνειεν, μικρά τινα τῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως παραφαίνειν εἴωθε.¹ Again:—Τίς δὲ οὐκ οἶδεν ὅπως σὺν αὐτῇ τῇ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ προσηγορίᾳ, καὶ σὺν εὐχαῖς καθαρωτάταις, πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνων ἔργον ἀπελαύνειν ἡμῖν φίλον ἐστίν;—Εἰσέτι δεῦρο πᾶς δαίμων καὶ πᾶν ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα, ὥς τι τῶν κολαστικῶν καὶ βασανιστικῶν τῆς οἰκείας φύσεως, τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τὸ ὄνομα φρίπτει, ὑπεξίσταται τε καὶ παραχωρεῖ τῇ τῆς προσηγορίας δυνάμει.²

“Constantia, the sister of Constantine, wrote to Eusebius, to desire him to send her a certain image, which was supposed to be the image of Jesus Christ: for Eusebius himself tells us that in his time there were to be seen pictures of our Saviour, of St. Peter, and of St. Paul; and that he had seen at *Paneas* a statue of Christ, which the woman was said to have erected, who had been cured by him of a bloody-flux. Eusebius returned an answer to Constantia, of which we have only some fragments remaining. It appears that he would not send it to her: but as to the reasons for his refusal, it is not easy to comprehend the solidity of them. All that can be said is that he endeavours to take her off from contemplating the human nature of Christ, and to induce her rather to consider his divinity. But he seems to go so far as to say that his humanity had ceased after his ascent into heaven, and he has been accused of entertaining this opinion. The enemies of holy images have made use of this letter; and they who have refuted them have allowed it to be genuine, but maintain that it was of no authority and weight, as coming from an Arian. It is certain that Eusebius seems not much to approve the use of images; and yet himself gives us reason to think that God approved of them, when he speaks of the miracles which were said to be wrought by the statue of Christ that was at Paneas; for he dares not maintain that what was related concerning it was false.”³

Eusebius relates the story of the statue at Paneas, as an historian; and gives it with an ἔλεγον, as a thing generally believed. He adds, for the sake of those who had ears to hear, that the Gentiles, who received miraculous favours from Christ or from his Apostles, might in all probability have honoured their benefactors by making statues and pictures of them, ἀπα-

¹ Dem. Ev. iii. p. 109.² Ibid. p. 132.³ Tillemont, H. E. vii. 43.

ραφυλάκτως ἐθνικῇ συνηθείᾳ, *indiscreetly and according to Pagan custom*. This shows that he was no friend to holy images, and to image-worship; and that he foresaw the bad use which would soon be made of these representations.⁴ Nicephorus reviles Eusebius as an enemy to holy images, as an Arian, and worse than an Arian, on account of this wicked letter of his to Constantia.⁵

“The second general council of Constantinople, assembled by Constantine, whom the image-mongers impudently called *Copronymus*, had condemned images; and had made use of a passage from the History of the Apostle St. John by *Leucius*, of which here is the substance:—A Christian, called *Lycomedes*, had got a portrait made of this Apostle, who, seeing a picture in the house of his disciple, and not knowing whom it represented, said to Lycomedes, ‘What is the meaning of this image, and for whom of your gods is it made? I see that you have not entirely renounced the customs of the Gentiles.’ Lycomedes answered, ‘I acknowledge only one God, namely, him who has restored life to me and to my wife. But if, after that God, one may call *gods* those good men who are our benefactors, you yourself are the god whom that image represents. It is you whom I crown, it is you whom I love, and whom I honour, as the faithful guide who hath conducted me to the source of all blessings.’—‘You banter me, my son,’ said St. John, ‘you are not in earnest, and you cannot make me believe that this is my picture.’ Then Lycomedes having reached a looking-glass gave it to St. John, who, discerning his own countenance, and comparing it with the picture, ‘As the Lord liveth,’ said he, ‘it is true that this image resembles me; but, my son, you have done a wrong thing.’ The bishops of the second Nicene Council inveigh, as we may suppose, against the author of this relation, and against those who had dared to make use of it. And indeed the witness was good for nothing; he was an heretic and an impostor. But as to the story itself, there is nothing in it contrary to the apostolical spirit, or to the faith and practice of the ancient church. If it be not true, it carries no small appearance of truth; and nothing brings it into suspicion, but the relater. That is more than can be said of a heap of authorities and

⁴ Euseb. E. H. vii. 18. See also S. Basnage, *Ann.* i. 307.

⁵ Le Clerc, *Bibl. A. & M.* xxiv. 3.

testimonies urged by these Nicene Bishops, where the facts are evidently false, the books certainly spurious, and the authors most impudent and audacious liars. This will appear a little rough, but it is very true, and there is no occasion to use any ceremony with such disingenuous and dishonest men.”⁶

Eusebius subjoined to his Ecclesiastical History an *Oration* of *Constantine*. It was composed in Latin by the Emperor, and translated into Greek by a very bad hand. It is also full of faults. *Tot mendis inquinata est*, says Valesius, *ut pene satius fuerit eam non extare*. The Pagans, says Constantine in this Oration, may be convinced of the divinity of Jesus Christ, εἴπερ τοῖς ἑαυτῶν λόγοις πιστεύωσιν. He appeals to the testimony of the Erythræan Sibyl, and therefore I believe it should be, τοῖς ἑαυτῶν λόγοις, *if they will give credit to their own oracles.*⁷

Thus much concerning Eusebius;⁸ to which it may be

⁶ Beausobre, Hist. de Man. i. 389. See also Fleury, H. E. T. ix. p. 543.

⁷ Orat. Const. c. 18.

⁸ Since Jortin has chiefly confined himself to the consideration of the religious opinions of *Eusebius*, it may not be amiss to subjoin a few remarks upon his character as an *historian*. He was born at Cæsarea in Palestine, about the year 270; and was raised to the bishopric of that see in the year 315. According to Jerome (Vir. Ill. c. 31), his works were exceedingly voluminous; of which there are still extant his *Ecclesiastical History*, in ten books; his *Life of Constantine*, and the *Demonstratio* and *Præparatio Evangelice*; together with some fragments of a *Chronicle*, preserved in Jerome's translation, and embracing the History of the World, from the Creation to the 20th year of Constantine. Though it partakes rather of the nature of a *panegyric* than a history, the *Life of Constantine*, which was written subsequently to the Emperor's death, contains much that is valuable; and, were it not for his history, little or nothing would now be known to us either of the annals of the early Church, or of the writers before his time. As authority for his statements, he quotes, in their own words, long extracts from authors contemporary with the events which they record, whose works are no longer in existence; he notes down the regular succession of bishops, the origin and progress of heresies, and the controversies which sprang up on points of ecclesiastical discipline; and he describes the several persecutions and the sufferings of the martyrs in defence of the Gospel. His fidelity indeed, in recounting the history of martyrdom, has been called in question, on his own admission (H. E. viii. 2), that he has omitted whatever might appear derogatory to the character of the sufferers, and related only such things as might be profitable to Christians in all ages. Now, the very fact of this admission proves the honesty at least, if it does not say much for the judgment, of the writer; and a calm and dispassionate perusal of the Ecclesiastical History will at once exonerate its author from any intention to deceive, at the same time that an avowed *suppressio veri* throws a shade of doubt upon the authority of his statements on this particular subject. Gibbon further accuses him of approving, on the authority of a passage of

proper to join a few remarks on the ecclesiastical historians who are his usual companions, Socrates, Sozomen, &c. "*Reading*, in his edition of these Ecclesiastical Historians, has joined to the notes of Valesius such observations of modern authors, as he had picked up here and there. They might as well have been placed at the end of the book; since they are much inferior to those of Valesius, both for style and matter, and appear with the same disadvantage as an ordinary painting placed by the work of an eminent master. "Valesius dedicated his work to the clergy of France, from whom he had a pension. He was sadly afraid of offending *certain persons*, who hold this maxim, that when an opinion serves to support a good cause, it may be piously believed, and it must not be attacked, be it ever so false and foolish." The misfortune is, that these *certain persons* are to be *found*, and to be *felt*, not only in the Church of Rome, but everywhere else.

2. *Socrates* was born early in the fifth century, and educated at Constantinople. He professed the law, and pleaded at the bar, and thence was called *Scholasticus*; the name which was then given to advocates. He wrote an Ecclesiastical History¹ with much accuracy and judiciousness, and with much plainness and simplicity of style, avoiding all rhetorical flourishes. He is sus-

Plato, "the occasional practice of pious and salutary frauds," and of "justifying the sentiments of the Athenian philosopher by the example of the sacred writers of the Old Testament." It is somewhat difficult to understand the sense in which Eusebius applies the scandalous proposition of Plato—*How far it is lawful and fitting to use falsehood as a medicine, for the benefit of those who require such treatment*" (De Leg. ii.) ; but, at all events, the observation which he makes upon it, is simply this : that "there are a thousand instances in Scripture, where God is described as *jealous*, or *sleeping*, or *angry*, or liable to other human affections, ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ τῶν δεομένων τοῦ τοιούτου τρόπου. (Præp. Evang. xii. 31.) It would seem from the absence of all allusion to the Arian controversy that the date of the History was prior to that of the Council of Nice. It was probably published in the year 324. Eusebius died in the year 340, after an episcopate of twenty-five years ; so that his birth, promotion, and death, were nearly contemporary with the corresponding epochs in the career of his imperial patron.—EDIT.

⁹ Le Clerc, Bibl. A. et M. T. xvi.

¹ Commencing nearly at the period with which Eusebius terminates, the History of Socrates comprises, in seven books, about 133 years, from A.D. 306 to 439. Events are arranged chronologically by Olympiads or consulates ; and contemporary documents are carefully and accurately compared.—EDIT.

pected by some of having been a Novatian, but Valesius defends him, and acquits him of the charge.² Yet he certainly entertained a very favourable opinion of that sect.³ He was a prudent, cool, and moderate man, who made no scruple to commend what he thought commendable in Christians of all parties; and, though he calls the society of the orthodox *the Church*, yet he did not believe that all they, who separated themselves from it, were therefore profligate people and reprobates. As he was a lawyer, says Le Clerc, he had learned and acquired from the course of his studies, a moderation and an equity rarely to be found in the ecclesiastics of that time. Upon all occasions he declares himself openly against⁴ persecution, and appears a true friend to liberty, civil and religious. Only in the affair of miracles he was too easy of belief, and has disgraced himself and his history by relating some foolish stories of the marvellous kind.

3. *Hermias Sozomenus* was also a lawyer. His style is rather more elegant than that of Socrates; but in judgment he is not equal to him. Being of a family which had excessively admired the monks, and himself born and bred up in Palestine, and educated at the feet of those *Gamaliels*, he contracted a superstitious and trifling turn of mind, and an amazing credulity for monkish miracles; and, in this respect, he became *magnus nugarum helluo*. He speaks of the benefit which himself had received from the intercession of Michael the Arch-angel.⁵ He and Socrates were contemporaries, and lived in the time of Theodosius Junior. As historians, they so often and so largely coincide, that the one must have transcribed the other, and there is reason to think that Socrates wrote first, and that Sozomen was the copyist.⁶ S. Basnage concludes that these two lawyers could not have had much practice and many briefs,

² Vit. Socr.

³ See E. H. vi. 21, and the notes of Valesius.

⁴ Julian, says he, did not attack the Christians with the cruelty of a Diocletian, and yet he may truly be said to have persecuted them; for I call it persecution to molest in any manner those who lead quiet and peaceable lives:—*διωγμὸν δὲ λέγω, τὸ ὁποσοῦν ταραττεῖν τοὺς ἡσυχάζοντας*. (iii. 12.) [The avowal of such a principle would be amply sufficient to convict the writer of heterodoxy, in the eyes of *Baronius*, the Romish historian.—EDIT.]

⁵ E. H. ii. 3.

⁶ See Valesius, *Vit. Soz.* [Sozomen's History is a continuation of that of Eusebius, from A.D. 323 to 423.—EDIT.]

since they found time to write Ecclesiastical Histories.' His argument is both uncivil and inconclusive.

"4. *Theodoret* is, in my opinion, one of the most valuable of the Fathers. He is learned; he reasons well, especially in his dialogues against the Greek heresies of his times: he is a good literal interpreter of the Scriptures. I cannot help admiring his prudence and his moderation, when I consider that he ended his Ecclesiastical History at the time when the Nestorian quarrels began, in which he was so deeply interested: but, I fear, his zeal against heretics imposed upon him almost as much as his admiration for the heroes of the Ascetic life, with whom he was charmed. Monasteries have undoubtedly sent forth great men into the world; but these disciples of the monks contracted there in their youth a superstitious disposition, which is hardly ever thrown off; and the weak side of this able man seems to have been an excessive credulity."⁸

Theodoret's learning and abilities were great, but he wanted the calmness and moderation and impartiality, which are requisite in an historian. He cannot speak of the Arians, and of the Emperor Julian, without losing his temper; he has given a good character to some worthless men, because he thought them orthodox; and in the point of miracles, he was either credulous beyond all measure, or he judged it expedient to keep up devotion and piety in the common people, by feeding them with legends suited to their taste. Whatever was his reason for it, he wrote the lives of the most eminent monks; in which we find a beggar who died suddenly, whilst he was acting the dead man to get alms from a saint, and then was raised to life again; a hermit fed by a lion, who used to bring him dates *in his pocket*; apples sent from heaven to the monks: a dead man declaring who had murdered him; Jews conducted by lions; the emperor's sick horse cured by a monk, who anointed his belly with holy oil, and made him drink some water sanctified with the sign of the cross; together with the marvellous exploits of Symeon Stylites; &c. A work how unworthy of Theodoret!

Dans ce sac ridicule où Scapin s'enveloppe,
Je ne reconnois plus l'Auteur du Misanthrope.

⁸ Sozomeno in ea arte constituto multum otii ex causarum penuria contigisse eo liquet, quod ad Historiam scribendam se converterit.—*Ann.* iii. 395.

⁴ Beausobre, Hist. de Man. T. i. p. 226.

Du Pin mentions this book and these miracles in a way which shows that he gave little credence to them, and this might help to draw upon him a persecution from those who perhaps believed them no more than he. Amongst the solitary saints celebrated by Theodoret, there was one who wore the same coat all his life, putting a patch where it was torn, from time to time. It would have been a proper subject for a metaphysico-theological debate in the fifth century, whether this continued to be the *same* coat under all these changes; and it would have furnished a fair opportunity for visions, revelations, and miracles in confirmation of the *identity* or *diversity* of the *holy tunic*, and then for censures and excommunications. In his writings against heretics of all denominations, he makes no mention of the Origenists, or of the Pelagians; whence it is probable that he thought them innocent. He himself has affirmed that *infants are without sin*; which smells strongly of Pelagianism.

He attacked *Cyril of Alexandria*; and he wrote in defence of *Theodorus Mopsuestenus*, an honest and a learned man, who had the misfortune to displease boobies; and this is the reason why he is not called *Saint Theodoret*. But he is called μακάριος, *the blessed Theodoret*, which is almost as good; and the title of *saint* became insignificant, or rather ridiculous, when it was given to such men as Cyril. *Contra Cyrillum scribere, idem pene est quod adversus Synodum Œcumenicam, cui præfuit Cyrillus. Itaque Nicephorus diserte affirmat Theodoritum contra tertiam Œcumenicam Synodum scripsisse. Atque idcirco, tametsi de Ecclesia Catholica optime meritus fuerit, nec natalis ejus dies annua commemoratione honoratus est, nec ipse inter sanctos Patres locum suum habet in Menologio.*⁹ Here we see one of the bad effects of a superstitious veneration for general councils. The reputation of Theodoret must be blasted, because he dared to oppose Cyril,—Cyril who was Lord President of the factious Council of Ephesus, and who disturbed the whole Christian world with his *quarrels* and his *anathematisms*.

Faucibus ingentem fumum (mirabile dictu)
Evomit, involvitque domum caligine cæca,
Prospectum eripiens oculis; glomeratque sub antro
Fumiferam noctem, commixtis igne tenebris.¹

⁹ Valesius, *Præfat.*

¹ Virgil, *Æn.* viii. 352.

Cyril's confession of faith (or his Anathematisms) was injudicious, obscure, uncharitable, and I think, not reconcilable with the Holy Scriptures. *Anathematismi ejus, si verum volumus, et obscuri sunt, et doctrinæ Nestorii peregrini. Eorum et nonnulli, primâ quidem specie, pietatem non redolent.*²

Theodoret was accused of being a Nestorian; a dreadful accusation in those days, when it was a far greater crime to have thought Nestorius innocent, than to have worshipped Judas Iscariot or an Egyptian monkey. But the Nestorian controversy was so perplexed on both sides, and involved in so many and so great difficulties, that the contenders should have agreed in pardoning and tolerating each other.

Theodoret was contemporary with Socrates and Sozomen, and seems to have written after them both, for his history often supplies the deficiencies in theirs.³

Theodoret's character may be found in an epistle which he wrote to a man of quality, and a consul; in which he thought it necessary for his justification to give some account of himself:—"My parents," says he, "before I was conceived, made a vow to God that they would consecrate me to his service, and they educated me according to their promise. After having passed my first days in a monastery, I was ordained bishop against my inclination. For twenty-five years I have so lived in that station, as never to be at variance, never to prosecute any one at law, or to be prosecuted. The same I can say of all the pious clergy who are under my inspection, none of whom was ever seen in any court of justice. Neither I nor my domestics ever received the smallest present from any person,

² S. Basnage, Ann. iii. 337. [*Cyril, the Nestorians, and the Council of Ephesus, will come under notice in the order of time.*—EDIT.]

³ Porro de historia Theodoriti optime omnino judicavit Photius in Bibliotheca. Ejus stylum ait præstantiorem esse Socratis et Sozomeni stylo: perspicuum enim esse et grandem, nec tamen redundantem, sed Historiæ rerum Ecclesiasticarum aptissime convenientem; nisi quod translationibus interdum utitur audacius, et, ut ita dicam, putide.—Illud præterea in historia Theodoriti reprehendendum mihi videtur, quod in toto opere nullam notam temporum adhibuit.—*Valesius.*—[It is generally supposed that *Sozomen* wrote to supply the omissions of Socrates, and that Theodoret intended to furnish a supplement to both. Dowling observes, however, in his work on the *Study of Ecclesiastical History* (p. 34), that there is "no direct evidence that any one of them was acquainted with the writings of either of the others." There seems to be little doubt of Theodoret's Nestorian prejudices; and they caused him considerable annoyances.—EDIT.]

not even a loaf or an egg. My patrimony I gave away long ago to the poor, and I have made no new acquisitions. I have neither house, nor land, nor money, nor a sepulchre where my friends may lay my body when I die. I am possessor of nothing, save the poor raiment which I wear. Out of the Ecclesiastical revenues I have built porticoes, and two very large bridges, and put the public baths in good condition. I found the city without water, and the inhabitants obliged to go to the river to fetch it. I built them an aqueduct which supplies them plentifully. I found eight villages infected with the heresy of the *Marcionites*, and one full of *Eunomians*, and another of *Arians*. I have converted them all, yet not without incurring much danger; having been often assaulted, wounded, stoned, and reduced to death's door."⁴ Thus Theodoret was ⁵extremely poor, and therefore not qualified to contend with Cyril, who was rich, and drew over the ⁶emperor to his side, by bribing an eunuch who governed his royal master.

During the Nestorian quarrel, when the emperor sent a letter to Theodoret, to let him know that, if he would not submit, he should be deposed and removed, he laughed at the threatening, knowing that he had nothing to lose, except his garment, and that some friend would give him another, and not let him go naked; but the Christians in his diocese were all greatly alarmed with the fear of being deprived of him, and earnestly importuned him to come to some accommodation for their sakes. His diocese was large, and contained eight hundred parishes.

Theodoret, speaking of the violent and cruel persecution raised against Chrysostom and his friends, says:—*Porro quot Episcopi ejus causâ pulsi sint Ecclesiis, et in extremos imperii Romani fines deportati, quot item Monachi eandem calamitatem perpassi sint, superfluum arbitror commemorare, et prolixam historiam texere: præsertim cum ea, quæ tristia sunt, contrahenda esse censeam, et Auctorum, qui ejusdem nobiscum sunt fidei, errata obtegenda.*⁷ But if Christians, giving a loose to pride, insolence, and revenge, treat their brethren and their betters with the utmost inhu-

⁴ Epist. 81, et Epist. 113. ad Leon. [Does not this savour somewhat of Pharisaism—"I am not as other men are?" But the circumstances of the case may have justified the egotism.—EDIT.]

⁵ Augustine was as poor as Theodoret; and so was Paulinus, bishop of Nola, who had parted with great possessions.

⁶ Theodosius Junior.

⁷ E. H. v. 34.

manity, and do what an honest Pagan would blush to do, is an historian to spare them, and to draw a veil over their iniquities, *because they were orthodox?* As I cannot commend Theodoret for this remark, so I think him very discreet for saying nothing in his history concerning Cyril, except these few words:—*Erat eo tempore Episcopus Alexandriæ Cyrillus, Theophili fratris filius, qui patruo in Episcopatu successerat.*⁸ As he had been at variance with Cyril, he did well to pass him by without praise or censure, especially if we consider how many things he might justly have said against him.⁹ The fifth general council, at Constantinople A.D. 553, thought fit to condemn the impious writings of Theodoret relating to Cyril and the Nestorian quarrels.

5. *Evagrius* was a lawyer, and a pleader, as it seems, at Antioch. He wrote a history from A.D. 431 to A.D. 594. “*Cæterum laudanda est in primis Evagrii diligentia, qui, cum historiam Ecclesiasticam scribere aggressus esset, quæcunque ad id argumentum spectabant, ex optimis scriptoribus collegit.—Stylus quoque ejus non improbandus est: habet enim elegantiam et venustatem, ut testatur etiam Photius. Sed quod præcipue in Evagrio laudandum est, ex Græcis Ecclesiasticæ historiæ scriptoribus solus hic rectæ fidei doctrinam integram atque illibatam servavit, ut post Photium observavit Baronius. Illud tamen in eo reprehensionem meretur, quod non tantam diligentiam adhibuit in conquirendis antiquitatis Ecclesiasticæ monumentis, quantam in legendis profanis scriptoribus.—Stylus præterea plerisque in locis redundat ac luxuriat, ut recte judicavit Photius.*”¹ “*A fabulosis narrationibus non nimis alienum esse Evagrium,*” scribit Casaubonus.”² “*Quæ de imaginibus, reliquiis, miraculis, Evagrius multa habet, ipsius Historiam in commendatione non ponunt.*”³ This is saying too little; for in points of theological controversy, *Evagrius* was an injudicious prejudiced

⁸ E. H. v. 35.

⁹ A very ample account of Theodoret may be found in Tillemont, H. E. xv. 207; Du Pin, B. E. iv.; Fleury; and Cousin, who translated Theodoret's History into French; and they are all friends and favourers of this prelate. Father Garnier published an additional volume to the works of Theodoret, and Dissertations upon his life and writings, with a view to insult him, to run him down as a heretic, and to censure him upon all occasions. If Theodoret had been a *Damasus*, a *Cyril*, a *Thomas à Becket*, a *Calendar Saint*, Garnier would have paid him more respect.

¹ Valesius.

² Fabricius, *B. Gr.*

³ S. Basnage, *Ann.* iii. 921.

zealot; and, in the article of miracles, a most ridiculous and contemptible bigot, and a relater of tales, which whosoever can swallow and relish, is fit, if we may be permitted to use the homely phrase of some poet, *Culum lingere Cerberi cacantis*. But then, as Photius, Baronius, and Valesius observe, he was always on the right side of the question; which is more than can be said of any other Greek writer of Ecclesiastical History, and which atones even for a want of common sense, and sets him above Eusebius and Socrates: for *Socrates*, says Tillemont,⁴ *was a lawyer, and very ignorant of the spirit and discipline of the Church. Hence it comes to pass that he commends equally either Catholics or Heretics, when they did things which seemed to him to be commendable.*

6. Theodorus Byzantius, *Lector majoris Ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ, duplex opus Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ conscripsit. Primum opus nihil aliud erat quam Historia Tripartita, duobus libris comprehensa, quam ex Socrate, Sozomeno, ac Theodorito unum in corpus collegerat.—Secundum opus duobus pariter libris comprehensum fuit, quibus res in Ecclesia gestas ab iis temporibus in quibus desierat Socrates, usque ad principatum Justini senioris (A.D. 518.) complexus est. Utinam vero Historiam Ecclesiasticam Theodori integram hodie haberemus. Multa enim scitu digna in ea continebantur. Consulatus quoque, quibus quidque gestum fuerat, accurate erant adscripti, ut patet ex fragmentis.*⁵

7. *Philostorgius* lived in the fourth and fifth century. His History reached from A.D. 300 to A.D. 425. It is lost, in a great measure; and there only remains an Epitome, or Extracts from it, made by Photius, and a few fragments. *Philostorgius* was an *Eunomian*: he censures the Semiarrians, as well as the Consubstantialists, and defends the Arians and the Eunomians.⁶

⁴ H. E. x. pp. 232, 233. ["Evagrius," says Dowling (p. 51), "is credulous, and perhaps prejudiced, but accurate and inquisitive."—EDIT.] ⁵ Valesius.

⁶ "Narrat autem Philostorgius fere contraria omnibus Ecclesiasticis Historicis, laudibus extollens quos novit Arianismo infectos, et conviciis Orthodoxos perfundens: ita ut hoc ejus opus non tam Historia esse videatur, quam hæreticorum laudatio, cum nuda et mera vituperatione atque accusatione Catholicorum. Stylus illi comptior; et poëticis sine tædio, minimeque ingratis vocibus utitur. Tropi quoque ac verba significantia gratiam ipsi cum jucunditate conciliant; nisi quod interdum audacius ipsis vel nimium detortis utendo, in frigidum et importunum sermonem incidit. Ornatur ab illo varie oratio, vel ad satietatem; ita ut in obscuritatem, nec

In his extracts from Philostorgius, Photius often begins a section with 'Ο δυσσεβής, ὁ φιλοψευδής. The *Impious Wretch*, the *Liar*, the *Enemy of God*, the *Dotard*, &c., says so and so.—But this was the way of Greek writers in all times, as Cicero observes. *Sit ista in Græcorum levitate perversitas, qui maledictis insectantur eos a quibus de veritate dissentiunt.*⁷

With all his defects, his credulity, and partiality to his sect, of which he had a large share, it is to be wished that we had Philostorgius entire; for he wrote the History of his own times, and of some persons whom he knew, and with whom he had conversed. It would not be amiss to have one Arian historian to compare with the Consubstantialists. He had picked up several miracles wrought by Arian bishops. The *Homoousians* rejected them with disdain, and yet boasted of miracles equally improbable.

Theodosius the First was a warm Consubstantialist, and was perpetually making absurd and severe laws against heretics: yet Philostorgius observes that he was a prosperous Prince, and blessed with success in all his undertakings, and supposes that Providence thus recompensed him for his zeal against Paganism.⁸ He also speaks very handsomely of Apollinaris, Basil, and Gregory Nazianzen; and observes that, of all the Consubstantialists, they were the most eminent for learning, eloquence, and elegance of style; and that Athanasius compared to them was a mere child, and a superficial writer. Apollinaris, though ranked amongst heretics for reasons mentioned above, yet joined with the Consubstantialists against Arianism.

XXXI. OF THE LAWS OF CONSTANTINE.

THE Laws of Constantine, most of which may be found in the Theodosian Code, are remarkable on one account or other. Several of them are humane and charitable, and such as the spirit of Christianity would naturally suggest.⁹ He and his

eam semper gratam, occulte trahatur auditor. Sæpe etiam sententias apte suis locis inserit.—Ipse vero scriptor mendax est, et a fabulis minime abstinens.—Miraculorum vero et vitæ gratia laudat Eusebium Nicomediæ Episcopum, quem etiam Magnum nominat, et Theophilum Indum, aliosque complures.—*Photius.*

⁷ De Fin. 11.

⁸ P. 539.

⁹ Of the *Laws of Constantine*, see also Fleury's *Eccl. Hist.* x. 21; and Heinichen's

successors made decrees which must have continually released multitudes from slavery. He abolished the cruel punishment of crucifixion, and of breaking the legs, and of marking the face with an hot iron. *Si quis in Ludum fuerit, vel in Metallum, pro criminum deprehensorum qualitate, damnatus, minime in ejus facie scribatur; dum et in manibus et in suris possit pœna damnationis una scriptione comprehendere: quò facies, quæ ad similitudinem pulchritudinis cœlestis est figurata, minime maculetur.*¹ The Pagans used to stigmatize themselves, but not in the face, out of religion.² Soldiers were also stigmatised.

He made a law against gladiatorial shows, which however continued, till Honorius put an end to that wicked diversion (A.D. 403). *Cruenta spectacula in otio civili et domestica quiete non placent: Quapropter, quia omnino Gladiatores esse prohibemus, eos qui forte delictorum causa hanc conditionem atque sententiam mereri consueverant, metallo magis facies inservire, ut sine sanguine scelerum suorum pœnas agnoscant.*³ It would amaze one to consider how many lives had been thrown away in these combats. *Credo, says Lipsius,⁴ imo scio, nullum bellum tantam cladem vastitatemque generi humano intulisse, quam hos ad voluptatem ludos. Mentior si non unus aliquis mensis Europæ stetit vicens capitum millibus, aut trecentis.*

He forbade the tax-gatherers to seize upon men's labouring servants, or oxen, for the payment of debts to the government. Even common prudence required this moderation; because such violent methods would have reduced farmers to a state of beggary, and so have made them for ever unable to pay their taxes;—*ex quo tributorum inlatio retardatur.*⁵ Zosimus says that he

Excurs. de Vit. Constant. in his Edition of Eusebius. Though they were for the most part unquestionably humane and tolerant, and highly favourable to the interests of Christianity and the progress of civilisation, it will yet be seen, from Jortin's analysis, that many of them were severe, and even cruel, and little tempered by the genuine spirit of the Gospel. It is clear that they partook of the spirit of that relentless ambition, which dictated his unrestrained vindictiveness against a conquered enemy, and of that unfeeling barbarity, which shrunk not from the destruction of a son.—EDIT.

¹ Cod. Th. L. ix. Tit. 40. p. 293, et Gothofred.

² See Van Dale, *Dissert.* p. 64; Grotius ad Apocal. xiii. p. 1205; and the commentators on *Levit.* xix. 28.

³ Cod. Th. L. xv. Tit. 12. p. 395.

⁴ Saturn. i. 12.

⁵ Cod. Th. L. ii. Tit. 30. p. 224.

oppressed the poor, and used them cruelly to make them pay their taxes;⁶ but Zosimus was a bigoted Pagan.

He restrained exorbitant usury or interest, allowing at the same time that which was fair and reasonable. The clergy were forbidden by Ecclesiastical Canons to receive any interest at all: and the senators, by the Civil Laws, were restrained from receiving as much as was permitted to other persons. The Fathers, who condemned all usury in general, did not consider that their scheme was practicable, only in the *Republic of Ideas*; and that the Roman Empire could no more subsist without money lent and borrowed upon interest, than without air and water.⁷

He ordered that prisoners should be well used, and conveniently lodged; and made laws in favour of slaves and of debtors.

He appointed that poor parents should be relieved out of the treasury, to prevent the exposing and murdering of children.

He made a very severe law against rapes; in which he decreed that nurses, who assisted in seducing or stealing away virgins, should have melted lead poured down their throats:—a barbarous and brutish punishment. He is supposed to have ordered all, who were guilty in this affair, to be burnt and cast to the beasts. His son Constans mitigated some of the severity of his father's edict; but appointed that slaves, who were found guilty, should be burnt.⁸

He restrained the frequency of divorces upon slight occasions, but admitted them for other causes besides adultery; and yet more liberty was taken by the Romans in the affair of divorce than the laws of Constantine allowed.⁹

He exempted the clergy from the burden of civil offices,¹

⁶ L. ii.

⁷ Cod. Th. L. ii. Tit. 33. p. 230. See Barbeyrac, *Morale des Pères*, p. 144; and an ingenious Treatise *de Fœnore et Usuris*, by G. Noodt.

⁸ Cod. Th. L. ix. Tit. 24. p. 189, &c.; and Valesius on *Sozom.* i. 9.

⁹ Cod. Th. L. iii. Tit. 13. p. 310, et Gothofred.

¹ Julian abolished these exemptions, and obliged the clergy to serve civil offices. His law is, *Decuriones, qui ut Christiani declinant munia, revocentur.* (See Cod. Theod. L. xiii. Tit. i. p. 7, and L. xii. Tit. i. *De Decurionibus*, p. 336, &c. and Gothofred.) *Sozom.* v. 5, Κληρικούς μέντοι πᾶσαν ἀτέλειαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ τὰ σιτηρέσια ἀφείλετο, καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν κειμένους νόμους ἀνεῖλε, καὶ τοῖς βουλευτηρίοις ἀπέδωκε. *Philostorgius* p. 514, Τοὺς ἐν κλήρῳ κατειλεγμένους εἰς τὴν τῶν βουλευτῶν ἀνέστρεφε λειτουργίαν.

which was often very heavy. This law, if I were not an interested person, I should venture to commend as reasonable. To this he added another, that there should be no more ecclesiastics ordained than were necessary;—a proper caution at that time, and in all times: for many reasons which it is needless to mention.

By a law addressed to the Roman people, he granted his subjects a permission to bequeath as much as they would to the Church. Every one knows how these donations were multiplied, and how bestowed in process of time, to the emolument of the Church; and, as the *Canon Law* assures us, of the State likewise. *Augmentatur namque Respublica in sustentando viros Ecclesiasticos, quorum precibus regna juvantur.* However that be, *Hinc deinceps opes Ecclesiarum, et inter alias Romanæ*, says Gothofred.² They who disinherit their children, grand-children, and near relations, for no fault, and leave their substance to pious uses and public charities, deserve to be treated as idiots and lunatics, and to have their will set aside as a *Testamentum inofficiosum*.

He is supposed to have given a civil jurisdiction to bishops, and to have made them receivers of appeals, and final judges in causes wherein religion was no ways concerned. Tillemont³ thinks that this was a grievous burden upon men who were desirous of being better employed, and had things of higher importance to perform. Synesius,⁴ who was a bishop, says, Πολιτικὴν ἀρετὴν ἱερωσύνη συνάπτειν, τὸ κλώθειν ἐστὶ τὰ ἀσύγκλωστα, i.e., *What has an Ecclesiastic to do with politics?*⁵

The old Roman laws showed no favour to natural children. Constantine, to discourage concubinage, and to encourage matrimony in persons who lived together in that way, ordered that if a man married his concubine, the children which he had by her before marriage, should become legitimate; but for natural children he made no provision, and gave them no relief. Valentinian I. afterwards permitted a father to leave a small part of

² Chron. Cod. Th. p. xxi.

³ *Hist des Emp.* iv. p. 295, and in the *Notes*. See also Valesius on *Euseb. Vit. Const.* iv. 27; and *Sozom.* i. 9.

⁴ Epist. 67.

⁵ "A Law of Constantine ordains that the single testimony of a bishop shall suffice, without hearing other witnesses. This prince took a short cut: he judged of causes by persons, and of persons by dignities."—*L'Esprit des Loix*, ii. 29. 16.

his fortunes to his natural children, and Theodosius Junior confirmed it.⁶

The first council of Toledo (A.D. 400) has this canon:—*He who, with a believing wife, hath a concubine, is excommunicated: but if his concubine is in the stead of a wife, and he adheres to her alone, whether she be called wife or concubine, he is not to be rejected from communion.* “This canon shows that there were concubines approved by the Church. According to the Roman laws, every woman could not be the legitimate wife of every man: both were to be Roman citizens, and of suitable condition. A senator could not marry a freed woman: a free man could not marry a slave; and the cohabitation of slaves was not called by the name of marriage. But a woman who could not be taken for a wife, might be taken as a concubine; and the laws allowed it, provided the man had only one concubine, and was not a married man. The children of such parents were neither legitimate, nor bastards, but natural children, acknowledged by the father, and capable of receiving legacies. The Church meddled not with these distinctions of the civil laws; but, regarding only the law of nature, approved every conjunction of one man with a woman, if it was with one woman, and perpetual; and the more so, because the Holy Scriptures employ the name of wife, or of concubine, indifferently.”⁷

Libanius being distressed by a law made against bastards, (for he confesses that he had one,) says that Theodosius granted him a dispensation, or even repealed the law to favour him.⁸

*Si quis, says Constantine, in orbe Romano eunuchos fecerit, capite puniatur.*⁹ Pagan emperors had made laws against this execrable crime.¹

He provided for the children of the poor out of his own revenues; and afterwards many charitable laws were made by him, and by Christian emperors who succeeded him, for the relief of the sick and helpless, beyond what had been done by Pagans; though something of that kind must have been always performed in civilized countries.² The temples of Æsculapius seem to have

⁶ See Gothofred *ad Cod. Th.* L. iv. *Tit.* 6. p. 351, &c.

⁷ Fleury, H. E. T. v. p. 120.

⁸ Liban. *Vit.* p. 61, 62.

⁹ *Cod. L.* iv. *Tit.* 42. 1. See also *Novel.* cxlii., and *Leonis Constit.* lx.

¹ *Digest.* L. xlviii. *Tit.* 8. 3, 4, 6.

² Concerning the places called *Valetudinaria*, or *Νοσοκομεία*, see Seneca *Epist.* xxvii.; *de Ira* i. 16; *Nat. Quæst.* i. *Præfat.*, and the notes of Lipsius, Gruter, and Gronovius.

been a kind of hospitals; and doubtless the priests, who were commonly physicians, used their best endeavours to cure the patients, and the honour of curing them was ascribed to the God. Pliny mentions the gall of a white cock, as a cure for disorders in the eyes: and an *old inscription* in Gruter informs us that one Valerius Aper, a blind soldier, consulted Æsculapius; that the God ordered him to make a salve of honey and the blood of a white cock, and anoint his eyes for three days; that he applied it, and recovered his sight, and came to the temple and returned public thanks to the God; and that this happened in the time of Antoninus Pius.³

He ordered that no woman of reputation should be arrested and forced out of her house for debt.⁴

He made a law against *Delators*, after his victory over Maxentius, with a view to settle peace and tranquillity at Rome. He ordered such offenders to have their tongues cut out. *Illud sane et ex hac lege et aliis nonnullis discimus, Constantinum pœnas acerbissimas legibus indixisse, si quisquam principum, ut vitia frangeret.*⁵

He published an edict, by which he declared himself ever ready to receive and hear any complaints against his officers, governors, and counsellors of state, which should be well grounded; and promised not only to do justice to the sufferers, but to recompense them for their pains.⁶

He made a law to punish adultery with death, which had not been a capital crime, in that sense, before in the Roman empire.⁷

He repealed the Papian law. One of the corruptions which soon crept into the Church, was a fanatical notion concerning celibacy, the recommending it too much, and the requiring it of several; for which the civil magistrate ought to have reprimanded and checked the ecclesiastics. The Fathers began from early times to talk weakly and injudiciously upon this subject, and to cry up a single life beyond measure. Augustus, to people the empire, exhausted by civil wars, and to restrain several abuses, made a law *de maritandis ordinibus*, which was called *Lex Julia*; and another called *Lex Papia Poppæa*, in which he encouraged and enforced matrimony by rewards to those who

³ See Harduin on Pliny, N. H. xxix. 38.

⁴ Cod. Th. L. i. Tit. 10. p. 57.

⁵ Gothofred, *ad Cod. Th. L. x. Tit. 10. p. 431.*

⁶ Cod. Th. Chron. p. 25.

⁷ See above, p. 145, and Gothofred, *ad Cod. Th. L. xi. Tit. 36. p. 295.*

should comply, and by heavy penalties on the disobedient. It may be right, where the exigencies of the state cannot be pleaded to the contrary, to leave persons more liberty in this than was granted to them by the laws of Augustus; but the good of civil society certainly requires that marriage be permitted to all, that it be accounted honourable, that it be attended with some privileges, and that the parents of a numerous family be considered, employed, and recompensed, *cæteris paribus*, beyond others, and in many cases have the preference. So thought, and so acted, the wise Romans, when they were in their most flourishing condition: but in the time of Constantine notions were entertained, which afterwards helped to fill the world with drones, mendicants, fanatics, and imaginary dæmoniacs, not to mention other bad consequences. Ambrose⁸ affirms that Alexandria, Africa, and the East, where there was the greatest number of religious virgins, were *therefore* more populous than other countries.

He restrained and discouraged, but did not absolutely forbid and suppress the Pagan practice of sacrificing, and consulting the entrails of victims, by the *Haruspices*.

The priests of the river-god Nile were *Androgyni*. Constantine commanded this scandalous order of priesthood to be suppressed.⁹ What could be the reason for which the Egyptians honoured their favourite god in this ridiculous and obscene manner? I shall here offer a conjecture about it. *Quum multi dii Paganorum utriusque sexus sive ἀρρενοθήλεις putarentur, Nilum inter eos fuisse numeratum minime mirum est. Ille Egyptum rigat et serit, tanquam mas: ejus autem limus sole calefactus et fruges et animalia parit; hoc fæmineum. Colebatur itaque vel ab androgynis, vel forsan ab impuris nebulonibus qui muliebria patiebantur.* The temple of Venus in Phœnice was a school of such sort of debauchery, and therefore destroyed by Constantine.¹

⁸ De Virg. iii. See Sozom. i. 9.

⁹ Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 25.

¹ Lucus hic erat ac delubrum, quod non in media urbe, nec in foro aut plateis positum erat, cujusmodi multa visuntur in civitatibus, ornamenti causa ambitiose constructa, sed devium procul a triviis et publico calle, fœdissimo dæmoni, quem Venerem appellant, in parte verticis Libani montis consecratum. Erat illic schola quædam nequitiae, omnibus obscænis hominibus, et qui corpus suum omni licentia corruperant, aperta. Quippe effeminati quidam, et fœminæ potius dicendi quam viri, sexus sui gravitate abdicata, *muliebria patientes Dæmonem placabant*: —Θηλεία νόσφ' τὴν δαίμονα ἰλεοῦντο. Ad hæc illegitimi concubitus et adulteria, fœdaque et nefaria flagitia eo in templo, tanquam in loco ab omni lege ac rectore vacuo, peragebantur.—Euseb. Laud Const. viii. p. 736. When Eusebius says, *θηλεία νόσφ' τὴν*

It appears from one of his laws, that the Pagans attempted sometimes to compel the Christians to join with them in acts of religion. He ordered such offenders to be bastinadoed; or, if they were rich, to be fined; which was not amiss.

By a law which condemns magic arts exercised to the hurt of others, he permits charms, and incantations, and such sort of tricks, intended for harmless or good purposes.

He made laws for the religious observation of Sunday.² *Sicut indignissimum videbatur, diem Solis, veneratione sui celebrem, altercantibus jurgiis et noxiis partium contentionibus occupari, ita gratum ac jucundum est, eo die, quæ sunt maxime votiva, compleri: atque ideo emancipandi et manumittendi die festo cuncti licentiam habeant, et super his rebus actus non prohibeantur.*³ Before this law, he had given one, which runs thus:—*Omnes judices urbanæque plebes, et cunctarum artium officia venerabili die solis quiescant. Rure tamen positi agrorum culturæ libere licenterque inserviant: quoniam frequenter evenit, ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis, aut vineæ scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas cœlesti provisione concessa.*⁴ The Emperor Leo repealed this law of Constantine, and published one more strict.⁵

δαίμονα ἰλεοῦντο, he borrows his expression from Herodotus (i. 105), ἐνέσκηψε δὲ Θεὸς θήλειαν νοῦσον. But θήλεια νοῦσος in Herodotus means τὰ καταμήνια, and they who think that it means something else, or something worse, are mistaken. See the Commentators on Longinus, who greatly admires this modest and polite periphrasis of the historian; and an Epistle of Musgrave *de hæmorrhagiis menstruâ virorum*, in the *Philos. Transact.* MDCCI. p. 864.

Bacchus was ἀρρενόθηλος. Theodoret iii. 7, Διονύσω τῷ γύνιδι—ἀφιέρωσαν ἐκκλησίαν, τὸ καταγέλαστον καὶ ἀνδρόγυνον ἐν αὐτῇ ἰδρύσαντες ἄγαλμα. Evagr. i. 11, Jupiter ἀνδρόγυνος γίνεται, εἰ καὶ μὴ τὴν γαστέρα, ἀλλὰ γοῦν τὸν μηρὸν κυοφορῶν, ἵνα καὶ ταῦτα παρὰ φύσιν αὐτῷ πράττοιτο· οὐ καὶ τὸ διθύραμβον κύημα ἀνδρόγυνον γενόμενον ἐκατέραν ἐνύβρισε φύσιν.

² Euseb. Vit. Const. iv. 18; Sozom. i. 8.

³ Cod. Th. L. ii. Tit. 8. p. 118.

⁴ Cod. L. iii. Tit. 13. 3. Compare this law with Virgil (*Georg.* i. 268); whom the legislator seems to have had in view:—

Quippe etiam festis quædam exercere diebus
Fas et jura sinunt. Rivos deducere nulla
Relligio vetuit, segeti prætere sepe,
Insidias avibus moliri, incendere vepres,
Balantumque gregem fluvio mersare salubri.

Macrobius, *Saturn.* i. 16:—Scaevola, consultus quid feriis agi liceret, respondit, Quod omissum noceret.

⁵ Constit. liv. Gothofred, in his notes on the Theod. Code, gives us the laws for

He obliged his soldiers to repeat on Sundays a prayer addressed to the one only God. The Christians would have died a thousand deaths, rather than have addressed a prayer to Jupiter; and therefore this may be looked upon as a sort of violence offered to the consciences of the Pagans: but it must be considered that the Pagans in general, the Roman soldiers in particular, were hardly troubled with pious scruples of this kind. They who used to worship their own worthless emperors living or dead, and their own standards, were not men who would have accounted this any oppression or infringement of religious liberty. If any of them had hesitated, his comrades probably would have laughed him to scorn, and have said to him, as one slave in Terence says to another who seemed to boggle at perjury,—*Nova nunc religio te istæc incessit*. The Christians at that time, being just delivered from persecution, must have had some sense of the odious nature of such cruel proceedings. Prudence also directed them not to terrify and provoke the Pagans too much; and therefore Constantine declared that he would compel no man to receive the Christian religion.

The first imperial law in favour of Christianity, which was published by Constantine and Licinius, began with this reasonable preamble;—*Ἡδὴ μὲν πάλαι σκοποῦντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς θρησκείας οὐκ ἀρνητέον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἐνὸς ἐκάστου τῇ διανοίᾳ καὶ βουλήσει ἐξουσίαν δοτέον τοῦ τὰ θεῖα πράγματα τημελεῖν κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ προαίρεσιν, κ. τ. λ.*⁶ But the Christians soon learned to sing a new song, and to acquire a taste for *wholesome severities*. First they deprived heretics of their places of worship; then they forbade them to assemble anywhere; and then they fined, imprisoned, banished, starved, whipped, and hanged them, for the advancement of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and for the honour of Christianity. Such were the dictates of *public wisdom*. In the meantime the bishops, in their councils, made canons forbidding any Catholic to marry his children to heretics, or to leave them any legacy, though they were the nearest relations. The *laws against heretics* collected in the *Theodosian Code*, stand as a shameful monument of the persecuting anti-Christian spirit, which brake out in the fourth century, and grew

the observation of Sunday, made from A.D. 321 to A.D. 425, by Constantine, Valentinian I. and II., and Theodosius I. and II. ⁶ Euseb. E. H. x. 5.

more and more violent in the following times. It is the duty of historians to give an impartial and just account of such cruel proceedings, that people may be taught to love their liberties, civil and religious; and to beware of those who would strip them of these blessings; and also, *ut qui insontes damnaverunt, ipsi causam dicant omnibus sæculis.*

He ordered churches to be built where they were necessary, and even where they were not; as in places which were inhabited only by Jews, says Epiphanius.

He condemned those who should βλασφημῆσαι Χριστὸν, *speaking evil of Christ*, to lose half their estate, if we may credit Nicephorus.⁷ This was an imprudent and unreasonable law, giving too much encouragement to indiscreet over-zealous Christians, or busy informers, to accuse Jews or Pagans, or perhaps heretics, of words spoken in the heat of dispute, or in common conversation. For the honour of Constantine we will suppose either that this law was never made, or that it was made *in terrorem*, and never executed. Such decrees are beneath a *Prince*, and only fit for an *Inquisitor-General*.

Afterwards, under Constantius, the severity of the laws against Paganism was increased, and sacrificing, together with idolatrous worship, was made a capital crime; which without question filled the Church with new Christians, such as they were: for there is not, I think, one Pagan upon record, who died a martyr for his religion in those days. Under Honorius (A.D. 408), we find a Pagan Confessor, one Generidus, an officer in the Roman army, who threw up his commission, because he would not conform to Christianity; but the Emperor could not well spare him, and so would not part with him.⁸

He (Constantine) made a law against *Heretics*, by which he forbade them to have any conventicles, and to meet together in public or in private to perform acts of religion.¹ This was mere insolent tyranny, and Eusebius deserves to be censured for having spoken favourably of it: and yet he is forced to own that it made many hypocritical conformists, and nominal Catholics. A fine acquisition! But Constantine, by commanding armies in his youth, and by his success and victories, and by being master of

⁷ Hær. xxx. 11.

⁸ Lib. vii. 34.

⁹ Zosimus, L. v.

¹ Euseb. Vit. Const. iii. 64, 65. Sozom. ii. 32.

the empire, got a royal and military habit and disposition of giving orders in a very absolute way, and had no just notion of religious toleration.

He also commanded that heretical books should be sought for and burnt.

He made a severe law against those who should embrace Judaism. This likewise was unreasonable. But we are not to conclude that all the laws of Christian Emperors against Paganism, Heresy, and Schism, were strictly executed. The contrary often appears: for the Roman Senate was much attached to idolatry, and Sozomen observes of Constantine, that he did not use to inflict all that he had threatened in his edicts;² and several Pagan writers, under Christian Emperors, declare themselves openly, and speak boldly enough in behalf of their old religion.

There is a law of Constantine, which shows that himself was not altogether free from Pagan superstition, in which he orders the *Haruspices* to be consulted, if any public edifice was struck with lightning.³ We may add to this, that a temple of the goddess *Concord*, being decayed by length of time, was repaired or rebuilt by Constantine, if we may trust to an inscription in *Lilius Giraldu*s. Zosimus pretends that he built some temples at Constantinople.

Constantine was severe in his punishments, which shows that by temper he was disposed to cruelty. If any civil officer drew a matron out of her house by violence, he decreed that he should be punished not only *capitali pœna*, but *exquisitis suppliciis*, i.e., says Gothofred, that he should be burnt alive.⁴ He appointed this punishment for various offences.⁵ To burn men alive became thenceforward a very common punishment, to the disgrace of Christianity. At last it was thought too cruel for traitors, murderers, poisoners, parricides; and only fit for *heretics*. One cannot help charging Constantine both with absurdity and with

² E. H. ii. 32.

³ See Le Clerc, *Bibl. A. et M.* xxviii. 157, &c.; Dacier on Horace, *Carm.* I. ii. 3; *Cod. Th. L. xvi. Tit. 10.* p. 257; and S. Basnage, *Ann.* ii. 673, who endeavours to excuse the Emperor.

⁴ *Cod. Th. L. i. Tit. 10.* p. 57, 58.

⁵ See *Cod. Th. L. x. Tit. 4.* p. 406. *Vivicomburii porro pœnam et aliis pluribus constitutionibus, et facinoribus facile imposuit Constantinus: quomodo et alias idem in exacerbendis pœnis aliquando nimius fuit.—Gothofred.*

hypocrisy on this occasion. He thought it a barbarous thing to brand a malefactor in the cheek or the forehead, and he made no scruple to burn him at a stake !

The military laws enacted by him and his successors are pretty severe, and burning alive was one of the punishments for greater offences. Perhaps it is impossible to keep up military discipline without rigour ; but certain it is that the case of soldiers and sailors has been frequently most deplorable, in their being so often subject to the arbitrary insolence of men who had not so much humanity as a wolf or a tiger : for a brute, when his hunger is satisfied, is not mischievous ; but men who are cruel, are so, full and fasting.

XXXII. OF THE DEATHS OF THE PERSECUTORS.

THE Christians, being blessed with an Emperor of their own religion, were of opinion that the Divine Providence had in a signal manner appeared in raising up and protecting Constantine, and in destroying the enemies of the Church. There is usually much rashness and presumption in pronouncing that the calamities of sinners are particular judgments of God ; yet if from sacred and profane, from ancient and modern historians, a collection were made of all the cruel persecuting tyrants, who delighted in tormenting their fellow-creatures, and “ *who died not the common death of all men, nor were visited after the visitation of all men,*”⁶ but whose plagues were horrible and strange, even a sceptic would be moved at the evidence, and would be apt to suspect that it was *θεῖόν τι*, that the hand of God was in it. But the case of the persecuting Emperors and Princes is still more particular, if we consider, first, the matter of fact ; and, secondly, the prophecies concerning it.⁷

1. *Herod* the Great was the first persecutor of Christianity, as he attempted to destroy Christ in his infancy, and for that wicked end slew the male children at Bethlehem. The miseries which befell this inhuman tyrant and his family are recorded by Josephus, and his calamitous death, and long and grievous

⁶ Numb. xvi. 29.

⁷ It has been already mentioned that Lactantius is the reputed author of a work on this subject ; and, thence, in all probability, Jortin’s attention was directed to it.—EDIT.

sufferings before it, by a burning fever, a voracious appetite, a difficulty of breathing, swellings in his limbs, loathsome ulcers within and without, breeding lice and worms; violent torments and convulsions; so that he endeavoured to kill himself, but was restrained by his friends. The Jews thought these evils to be divine judgments upon him for his wickedness. He left a numerous family of children and grand-children, though he had put some to death, which in the space of about an hundred years was extinct.

2. *Herod Antipas*, who beheaded John the Baptist, and treated Christ contemptuously, when he was brought before him, was defeated by Aretas, an Arabian king; and afterwards had his dominions taken from him, and was sent into banishment, along with his infamous wife Herodias, by the Emperor Caius. "Of *Salome*, the daughter of Herodias, it is related, that she going over the ice in the winter, the ice brake, and she slipt in up to the head, which at last was severed from her body by the sharpness of the ice: *idque non sine Dei numine*, God requiring her head for that of the Baptist's she desired; which, *if true*, was a wonderful providence."⁸ Whitby did well to say, *if true*; for the story has the air of a legend, was unknown to the ancients, can boast no better vouchers than Nicephorus and ⁹Metaphrastes, and is not adopted even by Tillemont.¹ Of all the actors in this tragedy, Salome may seem to have been the least guilty, as she was a girl of fourteen years, and acted under the command of her profligate mother.

3. *Pontius Pilate*, who condemned Christ to death, was not long afterwards deposed and banished, and died by his own hands. "Nor ought it to be passed over in silence, that Pilate himself who condemned our Saviour to death, fell into so great calamities, in the reign of Caius, that he became his own executioner, the divine vengeance overtaking him not long after his crime."² This we learn from the Greek historians."³

⁸ Whitby on Matt. xiv.

⁹ As to this compiler, we cannot help observing that he was not used according to his deserts by his contemporaries. The man's name was *Symeon*, and they surnamed him *Metaphrastes*; but they ought to have called him *Symeon Pseustes*, or *Symeon the Liar*.

¹ H. E. i. 101.

² *Ὀὐκ εἰς μακρὰν, non longo post tempore*; which is wanting in the version of Valesius.

³ Euseb. ii. 7, and Orosius, vii. 5.

4. The High Priest *Caiaphas* was deposed by Vitellius three years after the death of Christ, which gave no offence to the Jews, who loved him not. Thus this wicked man, who condemned Christ for fear of disobliging the Romans, was ignominiously turned out of his office by the Roman Governor.⁴

5. To these we may add *Flaccus*, the governor of Egypt, who persecuted, though not the Christians, yet the Jews in a most cruel manner (A.D. 38). "The wrath of God overtook Flaccus. Bassus, a centurion, giving the signal to his soldiers, came upon him and forced him away from his own table. His effects were seized, and he would have been sent to Gyarus, the most barren of all the islands in the Ægean sea, if Lepidus had not intreated for him that he might be banished to Andros. They say that one night, lifting up his eyes to heaven, he cried out, 'O king of Gods and men, thou art then a favourer of the Jews, and they do not falsely boast of being under thy protection!' When Caius had ordered all the exiles of rank and reputation to be destroyed, and had particularly named Flaccus, assassins were sent to dispatch him. When they landed at Andros, Flaccus guessed for what purpose they were come, and, getting into an unfrequented path, he fled to conceal himself: but they overtook him, and immediately some of them dugged a pit in the ground, others dragged him into it, as he was struggling and screaming, and stabbed him the more cruelly for his making resistance."⁵

6. *Catullus*, Governor of Libya, was also a cruel persecutor of the Jews, and died miserably, about A.D. 73. "Such was the lenity of the emperors towards Catullus, that their disapprobation was all the punishment which he then underwent; but not long afterwards he fell into a complicated and incurable disease, and died wretchedly; sorely tormented in his body, and worse in his mind. He was dreadfully terrified, and continually crying out that he was haunted by the ghosts of those whom he had slain: and, not being able to contain himself, he leaped out of the bed, as if he were tortured with fire, and put to the rack. His distemper increased, till his entrails were all corrupted, and came out of his body; and thus he perished, as signal an

⁴ Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 4.

⁵ Philo. See S. Basnage, *Ann.* i. 493.

example as ever was known of the divine justice rendering to the wicked according to their deeds.”⁶

7. The wicked and mad emperor *Caius* did not persecute the Christians, whom he knew not, but was determined to destroy the Jews with whom they were mixed; and blasphemed the God of the Jews and Christians; and wanted to set up his own image in the temple at Jerusalem, to be worshipped by all the nation. He was cut off by a conspiracy; and Petronius, governor of Syria, saved his life by it; for Caius would have put him to death, because he had delayed to execute those frantic orders.⁷

8. *Herod Agrippa* killed James the brother of John, and put Peter in prison: and the angel of the Lord smote him, and he was eaten with worms, and gave up the ghost.⁸ Whitby says;—“Examples of the like exits of the persecutors of the Christian faith, we have many in Church history. Thus Tertullian saith of one Claudius Heminianus, one of their persecutors, that, *cum vivus vermibus ebullisset*, when worms broke forth from him whilst he was alive, he said, *Let no man know it lest the Christians should rejoice*. And Eusebius saith of Maximian, *that sudden ulcers arose in his fundament and secret parts, from which sprung an incredible multitude of worms*. And of the uncle of Julian the apostate, who persecuted the Christians, and trampled upon the sacred vessels, Theodoret and Chrysostom inform us, that he perished by this disease, *for his scrotum corrupted and bred worms*. An instance like to this we have in Pherecydes Syrus, *eaten up of lice*, for boasting of his great wisdom and his pleasant life, though he sacrificed to no God at all.⁹ So also was it under the Jewish state: for of Antiochus Epiphanes we read, *that worms sprang out of the body of this wicked man*.¹ Add to these the story of *Pheretimé*, from Herodotus:—“Nor did this wicked woman come to an happy end; for as soon as she had returned from Libya to Egypt, after having taken revenge on the Barcæans, she perished miserably, being eaten up of worms. Thus immoderate revenge brings down the displeasure of the gods upon cruel persons.”²

⁶ Joseph. *B. Jud.* vii. 11.

⁷ See Tillemont, *H. des Emp.* i. p. 446, &c.

⁸ Acts xii. 23. Whitby *ad locum*.

⁹ Ælian, *Var. Hist.* iv. 28. Diog. Laert. i. pp. 75, 77. See Bochart *Hieroz.* P. 2. l. iv. 23, p. 620, 621.

¹ 2 Macc. ix. 8, 9, &c.

² Herod. iv. 205.

9. *Ananias*, the high priest, persecuted St. Paul, and insolently ordered the by-standers to smite him on the mouth. And Paul said, *God shall smite thee, &c.*³ Chrysostom and Augustin are of opinion that St. Paul, though perhaps he had no such design, spake this prophetically; for *Ananias*, after having contributed to the ruin of his country by a powerful faction which he had raised, and which produced many calamities, was slain, after the revolt of the Jews (A.D. 66), with his brother; and fell, not by the arms of the Romans, but by another faction of the Jews, which was headed by his own son.⁴

10. *Ananus*, the high priest, slew St. James the less (A.D. 62); for which, and for other outrages, he was deposed soon after by king Agrippa the younger, and probably perished in the destruction of Jerusalem.⁵

11. *Nero* turned his rage upon the Christians, A.D. 64. Four years after, in his great distress, he attempted to kill himself; but, being as mean-spirited and dastardly as he was wicked and cruel, he had not the resolution to do that piece of justice to the world, and was forced to beg help. Soon after came on the destruction of Jerusalem, and the punishment of that nation, and of their rulers for rejecting the Messiah.

12. *Domitian* persecuted the Christians (A.D. 95); and was killed the next year.

Trajan, *Titus Antoninus*, and *Marcus Aurelius*, did indeed suffer the Christians to be ill used, not through cruelty and tyranny, but by mistake and misrepresentations. These emperors had many great and good qualities, and nothing disastrous befel them. Eusebius has justly and judiciously represented the state of the Christians in those days:—"Trajan gave a rescript, in which it was decreed that Christians should not be sought out, but that if they were convicted, they should be punished: by which, though the violence of the storm seemed to be in some measure abated, yet ill-disposed persons still found opportunities to exert their malice, whilst sometimes the populace, and sometimes the governors, were contriving ways to oppress us. Thus

³ Acts xxiii. 3.

⁴ Tillemont, H. E. i. p. 274.

⁵ See Tillemont, H. E. i. p. 377, &c.

the persecution, though it was not general, was still kept up in different places; and many of the faithful were exposed to various trials and afflictions, and obtained the honour of martyrdom."⁶

13. *Severus*, who was violent and cruel, oppressed the Christians (A.D. 202). His latter end was calamitous; he was weary of his life: he left behind him a profligate eldest son, whose temper he knew, and whom he ought to have put to death, but had not the heart to do it; for the wicked wretch attempted to kill his father, and afterwards slew his brother. All the family of *Severus* perished miserably.

14. *Saturninus*, Proconsul of Africa in the reign of *Severus*, persecuted the Christians, and put several of them to death. He lost his eye-sight some time after.⁷

15. *Heliogabalus* brought a new deity to Rome, and intended to compel all his subjects to adore this God, and no other; or, at least to give him the preference to all other deities, and to make them no better than his *gentlemen ushers*, and *valets de chambre*: which must inevitably have brought on a persecution of the Christians; but this vile monster was slain soon after by his soldiers (A.D. 222.)⁸

16. *Decius* persecuted, A.D. 250. He reigned not three years, and died in battle. Pagan writers speak well of him. He seems to have distressed the Christians partly out of spite to the memory of his predecessor *Philip*, who had treated them kindly, and who is thought by several to have been himself a Christian; though surely a worthless one, and no credit to us. It is more probable that *Philip* was a Pagan.

17. *Gallus* persecuted, A.D. 251; and was killed the next year.

18. *Valerian*, who had many good qualities, was yet not only an enemy, but a very cruel enemy to the Christians. He was taken prisoner by *Sapor* the Persian king, and used like a slave and a dog, and as no Roman Emperor was ever treated, and died a poor miserable captive.

⁶ Euseb. E. H. iii. 33.

⁷ Tertullian, *ad Scapulam*.

⁸ *Heliogabalum consecravit; id agens ne quis Romæ Deus nisi Heliogabalus coleretur. Dicebat præterea, Judæorum et Samaritanorum religionem, et Christianam devotionem, illuc transferendam.*—*Lampridius*. See above, p. 4.

19. *Æmilian*, governor of Egypt, and a violent persecutor of the Christians, set up for emperor, and was taken prisoner, and sent to Gallienus, who ordered him to be strangled (A.D. 263).⁹

20. *Aurelian*, just intending to begin a persecution, was killed (A.D. 274).

21. *Maximinus* the first, a persecutor, reigned three years, and was killed.

22. *Diocletian*, by adopting associates, and sharing the empire and the troops with them, took the most probable method to secure the lives of the emperors from the arbitrary insolence of the army; which with little ceremony used to kill one, and set up another.¹ Yet all these precautions did not protect the emperor and his colleagues from divine vengeance. At this time

⁹ Gallieno jubente, dedit poenas : siquidem strangulatus in carcere captivorum veterum more perhibetur.—*Treb. Pollio*.

¹ “To prevent the continual treasons of the soldiery, the emperors associated to themselves persons in whom they had confidence; and Diocletian, pretending that the weight of affairs required it, ordered that there should always be two emperors and two Cæsars. He judged that the four principal armies, being in the hands of those who shared the empire, would check and intimidate each other; and that the other armies not being strong enough to make an emperor of their own choosing, they would lose by slow degrees the custom of electing; and, lastly, that the dignity of Cæsar being always subordinate, the power divided between four for the security of the government, would yet be in its whole extent and in reality only in the hands of two. But what kept the military men still more in order, was, that the wealth of private persons and the public revenues being diminished, the emperors could no longer bribe them with such vast presents; so that the profit was not proportionable to the danger of making a new election. Moreover, the *Præfecti Prætorio*, who for power and office were in a manner the *Grand Viziers* of those times, and caused emperors to be massacred at their own pleasure, that they might take their place, were greatly reduced by Constantine, who left them only civil functions, and instead of two made them four. Thus the lives of the emperors began to be better secured, and they died in their beds, like other people.” (*Considérations sur les Causes de la Grandeur des Romains*, c. 17. See *Œuvres de Montesquieu*, tome 5, p. 157. ed. Paris.) But if this change was advantageous in one respect to the rulers, it was detrimental in another to the poor subjects, who were burthened with an increase of soldiers and taxes. *Hinc denique parti Italiæ invectum tributorum ingens malum*; says Aurelius Victor. *Tres enim participes regni sui fecit (Diocletianus), in quatuor partes orbe diviso, et multiplicatis exercitibus, cum singuli eorum longe majorem numerum militum habere contenderent, quam priores principes habuerant cum soli rempublicam gererent. Adeo major esse coeperat numerus accipientium quam dantium, ut, enormitate indictionum consumptis viribus colonorum, desererentur agri, et culturæ verterentur in silvam.*—*Lactantius de Mort. Pers.* c. 7.

was the great contest between Christ and the Roman emperors, which should prevail. They were determined to blot out the Christian name from under heaven, and the persecution was far more fierce and brutal than it had ever been, and therefore it was time for Providence to exert itself; and so indeed it did. *Diocletian* persecuted A.D. 303; after which nothing prospered with him; he underwent many troubles, his senses were impaired, and he quitted the empire.

23. *Severus*, who was raised by Galerius, and therefore, like Galerius, not disposed to spare the Christians, was overthrown and put to death by Maximianus Herculius (A.D. 307).

24. About the same time, *Urbanus*, president of Palestine, who had signalised himself by tormenting and destroying the Christians, met with his due reward. "Immediately after the cruelties which he had exercised upon Pamphilus, and whilst he was still in his government, the divine vengeance overwhelmed him. He who the day before sat in the judgment seat, exercising dominion, surrounded with guards, and ruler of all Palestine; he who was the companion, the guest, and the most intimate and honoured friend of the tyrant, suddenly was stripped of all his dignity, and exposed to public ignominy before the face of those who had feared and revered him. The whole nation beheld their governor dejected, dispirited, poorly begging for mercy, and showing the meanest and most unmanly behaviour: whilst Maximinus himself, whose favour had filled him with vanity and insolence, and whose affection he had obtained by his barbarity to the innocent Christians, proved his most barbarous and inexorable enemy; and after having convicted him of many crimes, and openly shamed him at Cæsarea, condemned him to be put to death."² The ecclesiastical historian seems to have taken some pleasure in stigmatising this inhuman and cowardly governor; in consigning him to everlasting infamy; and in sacrificing his worthless name to the manes of his dear friend Pamphilus.

25. *Firmilianus*, another persecuting governor, met with the same fate. "It is proper to observe here how the governors, as well as the tyrannical emperors, were punished by God's providence: for Firmilianus, who had showed so much insolence and

² Euseb. de Mart. Pal. vii.

inhumanity to the martyrs of Jesus Christ, was condemned to die with several others, and was beheaded.”³

26. *Maximianus Herculus*, one of the persecuting emperors, was compelled to hang himself (A.D. 310).

27. *Maximianus Galerius*, of all the tyrants in his time the most cruel, and the first mover of the persecution, was seized with a grievous and horrible disease, and tormented with ulcers and worms, to such a degree, that they who were ordered to attend him could not bear the stench. He then made an edict, preserved by Eusebius, in favour of the Christians, that they might pray to God for him; and he died, A.D. 311. “The wrath of heaven fell upon him and afflicted him with a disease which seized his body and penetrated to his soul. An abscess was suddenly formed about his secret parts, with a fistulous ulcer, which preyed upon his bowels, and an incredible quantity of worms issued thence with an intolerable stink. For before this distemper, he had indulged his voracious appetite, and was grown extremely fat and unwieldy; and the huge mass of flesh, being totally corrupted, afforded a most hideous spectacle to those who were about him. Of his physicians some were put to death, because they could not bear the suffocating stench of his body; and others were still more barbarously condemned to the same punishment, because the remedies which they applied to him were ineffectual, and they could not remove an incurable distemper.”⁴

28. *Maxentius*, an enemy to Christianity, was overthrown in battle by Constantine; and, in his flight, he fell into the Tiber, and was drowned (A.D. 312). The Christians who were thus delivered out of the hands of this tyrant, compared his death with that of Pharaoh.⁵

29. At this time there was a dreadful famine in the eastern part of the empire, where *Maximinus* reigned; and a plague, which particularly affected the eyes, and took away the sight⁶: upon which the Christians could not forbear observing that

³ Euseb., *de Mart. Pal.* xi.

⁴ Euseb. E. H. viii. 16.

⁵ Euseb. E. H. ix. 9.

⁶ In the fifth century, there was a famine in Phrygia and the neighbourhood, and then a pestilence. Evagrius, ii. 6:—*Ex victus mutatione in morbum delapsi, corporibus ob nimiam inflammationem tumescentibus, oculos amittebant: simulque tussi vexati, tertio die moriebantur.*

Maximinus had inflicted that very punishment on many thousand Christians, and had caused one of their eyes to be bored out. The Christians signalised their piety and charity towards all persons in this public calamity; and forced even their Pagan adversaries to admire and commend their behaviour.⁷ At the same time *Maximinus* and his army suffered much in a war with the Armenians; with whom he had quarrelled, because they were Christians. *Maximinus* was defeated by *Licinius*; and then he repented, and made an edict favourable to the Christians, whom he had inhumanly oppressed and persecuted, and whose eyes he had put out. He died miserably, and upon the rack, his eyes starting out of his head, through the violence of his distemper (A.D. 313). All his family were destroyed, and his wife and children put to death, and with them many persons of rank, and governors of provinces, who had been his friends and dependents, and the ministers of his cruelty in tormenting and destroying the Christians; as *Pincentius*, *Culcianus*, *Theotecnus*. "Nor was his latter end like that of illustrious generals, who fighting boldly for their friends and their country, and for an honourable cause, met with a death no less honourable: but whilst his army was drawn up in the field, and ready to engage, he was lurking and hiding his cowardly head at home; and yet he could not conceal himself from God, who suddenly struck his whole body with a sore plague, and inflicted a punishment suitable to his impieties. For, being tormented with the most acute and insufferable anguish, he rolled himself upon the ground, and pined away by long fasting; so that his whole form was changed; and he looked like a withered and dried skeleton, or like a living sepulchre where the soul was buried in a rotten and dead body. At last through the vehemence of the inward inflammation, he lost his sight, and his eyes started out of his head; and yet still breathing and confessing his sins, he called upon Death to come and release him, which advanced slowly, and not till he had acknowledged that he deserved what he suffered, for his cruelty, and for the insults which he had committed against Jesus Christ."⁸

⁷ Euseb. E. H. ix. 3.

⁸ Euseb. E. H. ix. 10.—Tarsum postremo confugit (*Maximinus*). Ibi cum jam terra marique perterreretur, nec ullum speraret refugium, angore animi ac metu

Eusebius, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and Lactantius, as he is commonly called, agree that Maximinus lost his eyesight before he died. In the circumstances wherein Lactantius and Eusebius differ, the preference seems due to Eusebius, as to one who might be better informed of the truth, and who was less inclined to embellish it with common reports. "After this, most of the enemies of our religion were despoiled of all their honours. All the rulers of provinces were put to death, who had acted on the side of Maximinus, and who to please him had cruelly treated the Christians; as Pincentius his principal favourite, Culcianus, who had destroyed so many Christians in Egypt, together with several others who had assisted in establishing and supporting his tyranny. Nor did the divine justice suffer Theotecnus, one of our violent persecutors, to escape unpunished."

30. A *Roman officer*¹ whose name Eusebius hath not recorded, to oblige Maximinus, oppressed the Christians at Damascus, and spread calumnies against them; and not long after he died by his own hands, says Eusebius, and inflicted upon himself the punishment due to his wickedness.

31. *Licinius*, the last of these persecutors, was conquered, and put to death by Constantine (A.D. 323). This worthless and stupid prince could not read or write his own name, and hated all men of learning as much as he did the Christians. "His education, rustic, and suitable to his mean and obscure birth, made him totally ignorant of letters. He was a declared enemy to all learning, and called it the pest and the poison of the state; but he had a particular hatred for the profession of the law. He

confugit ad mortem, quasi ad remedium malorum quæ Deus in caput ejus ingessit. Sed prius cibo se infersit ac vino ingurgitavit, ut solent hi qui hoc ultimo se facere arbitrantur. Et sic hausit venenum. Cujus vis, stomacho reperiussa, valere non potuit in præsens, sed in languorem malum versa pestilentiae similem, ut diutius protracto spiritu cruciamenta sentiret. Jam sævire in eum coeperat virus; cujus vis cum præcordia ejus ureret, insustentabili dolore usque ad rabiem mentis elatus est, adeo ut per dies quatuor insania percitus haustam manibus terram velut esuriens devoraret. Deinde post multos gravesque cruciatus, cum caput suum parietibus infligeret, exilierunt oculi ejus de caveis. Tunc demum, amisso visu, Deum videre coepit candidatis ministris de se judicantem. Exclamabat ergo, sicut ii qui torqueri solent, et non se sed alios fecisse dicebat. Deinde quasi tormentis adactus fatebatur, Christum subinde deprecans et plorans ut suimet misereretur. Sic inter gemitus, quos tanquam cremaretur edebat, nocentem spiritum detestabili genere mortis efflavit.—Lactantius *de Mort. Pers.* c. 49.

⁹ Euseb. E. H. ix. 11.

¹ E. H. ix. 5 6.

also took a delight in tormenting the most illustrious philosophers, and in making them suffer the punishments inflicted on the vilest slaves, for crimes laid to their charge of which they were innocent.”² Thus perished this foe to religion, liberty, and literature; whose memory will not perish, but stink through all ages :

Καὶ λίην κεῖνός γε εἰκότι κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ.

*Ὡς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος, ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι.

The Christians had an illustrious friend and protector in *Constantius*, the father of Constantine, although he was a Pagan. He lived highly honoured, and greatly beloved by his subjects; his reign was prosperous; he died in peace, leaving several children, of whom the eldest succeeded in his dominions; and became master of the Roman empire.

32. After Christianity was thus established, the emperor *Julian* renounced the faith in which he had been educated, and oppressed the Christians, and endeavoured to restore Paganism. But having reigned a short time, he was cut off in the midst of his days, and perished in his rash and unhappy expedition against the Persians. As this prince had his good as well as his bad qualities, Providence seems to have permitted him to fall in battle, and to die an honourable death.

33. They who were employed or permitted by Julian to persecute the Christians, are said to have perished miserably and remarkably. Tillemont gives us the following account of them, faithfully collected from ancient fathers and ecclesiastical historians, which probably contains many truths, mixed with some exaggeration and embellishment; for such was the genius of those times, that doubt and diffidence are unavoidable, where angels, and devils, and monks, and miracles, and visions, and divine judgments are the subject. The apparitions of armed men, and the revelations which were made to Christians of Julian's death, may justly be taken in the lump as so many pious frauds.

“We have observed that *Count Julian*, with *Felix* superintendent of the finances, and *Elpidius* treasurer to the emperor, apostates all three, had received orders to go and seize the effects of the church of Antioch, and carry them to the treasury. They

² Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* iv. p. 103.

did it on the day of the martyrdom of St. Theodoret, and drew up an account of what they had seized. But Count Julian was not content with taking away the sacred vessels of the church, and with profaning them by his impure hands. Carrying to greater lengths the outrage he was doing to Jesus Christ, he overturned and flung them down on the ground, and sat upon them in a criminal manner, so as to commit actions which one dare not name; adding to this all the banters and blasphemies that he could devise against Christ and against the Christians, who, he said, were abandoned of God. Euzoïus, bishop of the Arians, who were still in possession of the great church, opposing himself to these sacrileges, received from him a blow on the face. Felix, the superintendent, signalised himself also by another impiety; for as he was viewing the rich and magnificent vessels which the Emperors Constantine and Constantius had given to the church, 'Behold,' said he, 'with what plate the son of Mary is served!' It is said that Count Julian and he made it the subject of banter, that God should let them thus profane his temple, without interposing by visible miracles.

"But their impieties remained not long unpunished, and Julian had no sooner profaned the sacred utensils, than he felt the effect of divine vengeance. He passed the following night with much disquiet; and the next morning he presented to the Emperor an inventory of all that had been seized in the church; and then he informed him of what he had done the evening before, with relation to St. Theodoret. He had done it with a view to please that prince: but the emperor told him plainly that he approved not his putting a Christian to death for no other cause than his religion; and in the very place where he (the emperor) was, which would make it believed that it was done by his secret orders. He complained that this would afford an occasion to the Galilæans to write against him, as they had written against his predecessors, and to make a saint and a martyr of Theodoret. He absolutely commanded him, not only to put no more Christians to death, but to suffer none else to do it. The Count, who little expected such a reception and reply, remained greatly confounded. The Emperor, to comfort him, told him that he should go along with him, to sacrifice to the gods, and by that means to obtain the remission of his

fault: and the priests of the idols having presented to the emperor some fowls and other food which had been offered to the devil, he ate of them, and gave some to his uncle. The respect and fear with which the Count was seized, permitted him not to eat much. He then retired to his own house, vexed that he had done an odious action, and had also displeased the Emperor, so that he would not take any nourishment.

“ Yet the little, that he had eaten, would not digest; and in the evening he had a disorder in his bowels, which gave him violent pain. He fell into a grievous and unknown disease, and his inward parts being corrupted, he cast out his liver and his excrements; not from the ordinary passages, but from his miserable mouth, which had uttered so many blasphemies. His secret parts, and all the flesh round about them corrupted also, and bred worms; and to show that it was a divine punishment, all the art of the physicians could give him no relief; though, on account of his high rank, and his near relation to the emperor, they employed all kinds of remedies. They killed a great number of the choicest and fattest birds, and applied them to the rotten places, to draw out the worms; but the worms, instead of coming forth, entered deeper into his flesh, devouring all that was corrupted, and penetrating to the quick. They got into his stomach, and from time to time came out of his mouth; whilst, to increase his affliction, the very Pagans made a jest of it. *Philostorgius* says that he remained forty days without speech or sense. He then came to himself a little; and his wife who, as it is reported, was illustrious for her faith, and who had warned him to spare at least the lives of the Christians, represented to him that he ought to acknowledge and bless the mercy of Jesus Christ, who in chastising him showed him his power; whereas, if he had left him unpunished, and used his ordinary forbearance, he would never have known whom he had set at defiance. This miserable man, pressed by these remonstrances of his wife, and by the sense of his pain, acknowledged that this was the true cause of his sufferings; he detested the crime which was thus severely punished, and bare testimony of his own impiety. He called upon the God of the Christians, and intreated him to have pity on him, or at least to take him soon out of the world; and he pressed his

wife to go and pray for him at church, and to desire the prayers of the Christians. But for all this, he appeared to have been no more converted than Antiochus; and he is said to have put to death several Christians only three days before he ended his life. His wife also declared to him that she dared not pray for his recovery, lest she should draw down divine wrath upon herself.

“Yet he entreated the emperor to restore to the Christians the churches which he had taken from them, and to cause them to be opened: but he could not obtain from him even that favour, and received only this answer, *It was not I who shut them up* [except the principal church], *but I will give no orders to have them set open.* At another time the Count sent him word, that it was because of him, and of having quitted Christianity for his sake, that he suffered such grievous pain, and perished miserably; to which Julian, without fearing the hand of God, or showing at least some compassion for a person so nearly related, sent him this reply:—*You have not been faithful to the gods, and it is for that you suffer such torments.*

“At length the imposthumes all over his body, and the worms which gnawed him continually, reduced him to the utmost extremity. He threw them up, without ceasing, the last three days of his life, with a stench which he himself could not bear. Thus he ended his life by a shameful and miserable death, passing from a punishment of many days to a punishment of eternal duration. He died, if we may believe Philostorgius, whilst they were reading to him divers responses lately made by oracles, all of them promising that he should not die of any distemper. His nephew Julian lamented him as little dead as living; and resolving not to give glory to Christ, he continued to declare that his calamity befel him for not having been faithful to the gods. In one of his writings, he says of him, that he had governed the city of Antioch with much justice; but he immediately adds, not with sufficient prudence. He there speaks of his death without adventuring to touch upon any of its circumstances.

“The disease, with which God visited Felix the Superintendent, was not so long; for it carried him off in the space of a day, if not more speedily. St. Chrysostom says that he burst

suddenly in the middle of his body, by which he meant perhaps what Philostorgius relates, that one of his larger veins bursting, without any straining, the blood flowed from his mouth all the night, or all the day, according to Theodoret: so that in the evening, his blood being all gone, he lost his life, as well as Count Julian, and fell into everlasting death. Ammianus entirely agrees with this, saying that he died suddenly, of a loss of blood.

“There was, it seems, a public place, where were written the names of those who died, and the people reading there the names of *Felix*, a title usually given to emperors, and of *Julian*, added that of *Augustus*, as if it had been the emperor himself who was deceased; and this was looked upon as a presage that he would soon be amongst the dead.

“Elpidius, the treasurer, who with Julian and Felix went to pillage the church, was also punished as well as they, though a little later: for, being convicted of having favoured the revolt of Procopius against Valens (A.D. 366), he was stripped of his effects, and shut up in prison; where, after having continued for some time, he died without reputation and honour, cursed of all the world, and surnamed Elpidius the Sacrificer, or the Apostate.

“A fourth, who, according to Philostorgius, had a share in the same sacrilege, and had shamefully profaned the holy altar, was instantly punished like Count Julian; for those parts of his body, which he had abused in committing his crime, were ulcerated, and the worms which bred in them destroyed him miserably.

34. “The justice of God was also made manifest by many punishments of the same kind inflicted on other apostates; and it may not be amiss to collect what history has preserved concerning it. One who was called *Hero*, a native of Thebes in Egypt, and bishop of that place, as the Alexandrian Chronicle seems to say, having voluntarily renounced the faith at Antioch, was instantly seized with a disease which corrupted all his body, and made him a hideous spectacle, and a dreadful example of divine justice. He was seen lying in the streets and public places, deprived of all assistance, and even of the pity and compassion of the beholders. The Christians abhorred his perfidy;

and the Pagans, after they had seduced him, showed him no regard. Thus he expired miserably in the sight of all the world.

“*Theotecnus*, a presbyter of Antioch, fell voluntarily into the same crime, deluded by fair promises; and was punished as instantly and as severely as Hero. His flesh in a short time was corrupted and overrun with worms, and he lost his sight. At last he went mad, and bit and devoured his own tongue, and from these torments passed to others far more terrible.

“We must not omit the punishment which befel one *Thalassius*, a man famous for his impurities and debauchery, who is said even to have prostituted his own daughter. He died, buried under the ruins of his house, which fell upon him. Theophanes assures us that his wife and all his household, who professed Christianity, were preserved from this disaster; and a child of seven years old, being asked how he had escaped, answered that he was carried out by an angel. The Alexandrian Chronicle places the death of Theotecnus, Hero, and Thalassius, in the year 363.

“St. Gregory Nazianzen marks out in general the stories which we have related, and adds diverse particularities, but without naming the persons. Who, says he, could describe the tragical accidents, the diseases, the different plagues and punishments, with which divine justice visited the impious, each of them in a manner suitable to his crime? Some burst asunder in the sight of all men; others were taken off by extraordinary deaths. In the midst of their torments they confessed their crimes with a fruitless and unavailing grief. Some by dreams of the night, others by visions of the day, had their impiety set before them. Who, I say, could enumerate all the calamities by which God in a visible manner avenged the demolition of the churches, the injuries done to the holy table, the profanation of the sacred vessels, and the cruel usage of the servants of Jesus Christ?”³

35. A deacon, called *Cyril*, in the time of Constantius, had signalised himself by destroying several images of the gods at Helio-
polis. The *Pagans* were so enraged at this, that, when Julian reigned, they seized and slew Cyril, and ripped open his belly,

³ Tillemont, H. E. vii. 395.

and ate his liver. The Divine vengeance pursued all those who had been guilty of this crime; their teeth came out, their tongues rotted, and they lost their sight. So says Theodoret.⁴

36. *Valens*, who was made emperor A.D. 364, was a Christian; but being of the Arian party, and of a cruel temper, he became a persecutor of the Consubstantialists. Fourscore Presbyters came to him to complain of the ill-usage which they had received from the Arians; whereupon it is reported that he caused them to be put to sea, and burnt alive in the ship. Afterwards, in a battle with the Goths, he was defeated, and wounded, and fled to a cottage, where he was burnt alive, as most historians relate. All agree that he perished.⁵ The Consubstantialists called his death a judgment: but if so, it was rather a punishment of his cruelty than of his heresy; of his cruelty, which was exercised not only on the party which he disliked, but on all his subjects.

37. Theodosius (A.D. 394), after having been almost defeated, and reduced to great distress, obtained a signal victory over Eugenius, which was generally thought to have been by a particular Providence, commanding the storms to fight for him. So say Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Rufinus, Ambrose, Augustin, and Orosius; and it is thus elegantly represented by Claudian, though he was a Pagan:—

Te propter gelidis Aquilo de monte procellis
Obruit adversas acies, revolutaque tela
Vertit in auctores, et turbine repulit hastas,
O nimium dilecte Deo, cui fundit ab antris
Æolus armatas hiemes; cui militat æther,
Et conjurati veniunt ad classica venti!

The Christians to this added other embellishments suitable to the taste of those times; as, that the victory was foretold by celestial visions, dreams, and dæmoniacs, and obtained by the aid of John the Baptist, the tutelar saint of Theodosius. Supposing it to have been the effect of a particular Providence, which might be the case, good reasons may be assigned for it. *Arbogastes*, a general, and a man of great authority, basely murdered his young emperor, Valentinian II.; and set up Eugenius in his place. Arbogastes was a Pagan and an enemy to Christianity; and Eugenius, the usurper, was a sort

⁴ H. E. iii. 7.

⁵ See Socrates, iv. 16, 38, and the notes.

of nominal Christian⁶; who took every step to endear himself to the Pagans, and from whose favour they expected great things. We may therefore look upon this war as upon a struggle between Paganism and Christianity, in which the latter, by God's blessing, was superior, without ascribing the success to the orthodoxy of the emperor, and to the intervention of saints.⁷ Theodosius, when he was to engage with Eugenius, shut himself in a church one night, to pray; and, falling asleep, he saw in a vision two men in white apparel, on white horses, who promised him that they would assist him; the one was St. Philip the apostle, and the other St. John the Evangelist.⁸ In Tillemont⁹ this important vision is represented *en taille-douce*, in a print, in the frontispiece, as the most signal occurrence in the fourth century. The story seems to have been borrowed from the old Pagan story of Castor and Pollux, who fought for the Romans, and appeared *equis candidis insidentes*, as the Roman historians inform us. The only thing wanting to complete the parallel was, that the apostles should have stroked the emperor's beard, and turned it red. Whilst the battle was fought, a dæmoniac at Constantinople was raised up in the air, and began to curse John the Baptist, and to reproach him that he had been beheaded, and to scream out, It is you who conquer me and destroy my army.¹ Either the devil and Sozomen, or else Theodoret, seem to have made a mistake; for the two first ascribe the victory to John the Baptist, and the third to John the Evangelist.

38. The last Pagan prince, who was a formidable enemy to Christianity, was *Radagaisus*, a king of the Goths. He threatened no less than the ruin of the Roman empire, and invaded it with an army, as it is said, of four hundred thousand men, about A. D. 405. The Romans were saved from the hand of this barbarian, and slew him, and obtained a most signal victory, which they ascribed to a particular Providence. Tillemont has collected, with his usual accuracy, what is recorded concerning this great deliverance.² S. Basnage also has given a large account of it.³

⁶ Philostorgius says that he was a Pagan (p. 538).

⁷ See Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* v. 356, &c.

⁸ Theodoret, v. 24.

⁹ *Hist. des Emp.* T. v.

¹ Sozom. vii. 24.

² *Hist. des Emp.* v. 538.

³ *Annal.* iii. 212.

Radagaisus had vowed to sacrifice all the Romans to his gods. The Pagans in Rome and in Italy, who still were numerous, imputed these calamities to the introduction of Christianity, and to the suppression of Paganism; and were disposed to rebel, and to re-establish their old religious rites. But the Romans, commanded by Stilicho, obtained a complete victory, without any loss of men; and Radagaisus, together with his sons, was taken prisoner, and put to death. Baronius assures us that the victory was owing to the assistance of Ambrose; though Augustin, and Orosius, who give the glory of it to God, might have taught him better. If bigotry and political godliness did not eat up all shame, Christians would not presume to ascribe a wonderful deliverance to Ambrose, rather than to Jesus Christ, upon the authority of an obscure mortal, one Paulinus; who wrote a life of Ambrose full of lying miracles, and who yet has not affirmed it.

But, it seems, the divine Providence can do nothing without the intercession of Saints. "Radagaisus besieged Florence. This city was reduced to the utmost straits, when Saint Ambrose, who had once retired thither, and who had now been dead nine years, appeared to a person of the house where he had lodged, and promised him that the city should be delivered from the enemy on the next day. The man told it to the inhabitants, who took courage, and resumed the hopes which they had quite lost: and on the next day came Stilicho with his army. Paulinus, who relates this, learned it from a lady who lived at Florence. And this proves what Saint Paulinus says, that God granted the preservation of the Romans to the prayers of Saint Peter, Saint Paul, and the other Martyrs and Confessors, who were honoured by the Church throughout the Empire."⁴ One might have asked Saint Paulinus, the bishop of Nola, where wast *thou*, when the Apostles and Martyrs made supplication for the Romans? Didst thou stand by, and hear them? Say no more about it, but go thy ways and cut chips out of *the cross*, which, as thou hast told us, *grows again as fast as it is diminished*.

39. *Hunneric*, the Vandal, was an Arian, a cruel Prince, and a most inhuman persecutor of the Consubstantialists (A. D. 484). This barbarian spared not even those of his own sect, or his own

⁴ Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* v. p. 540.

friends and kindred. His end, as historians relate, was suitable to his iniquities; and such as he would have equally deserved, if he had been a Consubstantialist, and had destroyed the Arians. His sufferings, supposing them to be divine judgments, prove nothing at all as to the controversy: but only this, that God hates tyranny and cruelty, the wickedness of which is a clear and uncontested point. “Dum diris cruciatibus Ecclesiam Africanam lacerat Hunnericus, sensit non mortalibus, sed Christo injuriam se fecisse, elementis ipsis primum ad pœnas impio irrogandas festinantibus. Pluviâ negatâ, remansit lurida terræ facies: nullis arbores frondibus, nullis segetibus tellus cooperiebatur. Lues gravem animalibus et hominibus cladem immittebat. Juvenum, senum, adolescentium, adolescentularum, puerorum agmina, simul et funera, passim diffundebantur. Catervatim Carthaginem confluebant animata cadavera. Miseros ea urbe pelli Rex e vestigio jubet, *ne contagio deficientium commune pararet etiam exercitui ejus sepulchrum*. Neque multo post regio corpori horrenda pœna irrogatur, quam Victoris verbis referemus:— *Tenuit sceleratissimus Hunnericus dominationem regni annis septem, mensibus decem, meritorum suorum mortem consummans. Nam putrefactum et ebulliens vermibus non corpus, sed partes corporis ejus videntur esse sepultæ*. Multa de suo, vel ex falso rumore petita, tragicæ Hunnerici morti addidit Gregorius Turonensis:— *Hunnericus post tantum facinus arreptus a Dæmone, qui diu de Sanctorum sanguine pastus erat, propriis se morsibus laniabat. In quo etiam cruciatu vitam indignam justa morte finivit. Dirum magni regis supplicium ubique locorum clamat, Discite justitiam moniti, nec temnite Christum.*”⁵

There is nothing improbable in Victor's account; but yet he is a writer who deals so much in the marvellous, that there is no trusting him. More credit ought to be given to the excellent Thuanus, who thus represents the barbarities and the death of some modern persecutors.

40. In the reign of Francis the First, the remainder of the *Vaudois* were massacred by the French Catholics with the utmost brutality. “The Baron *D'Oppede*, who conducted the affair, was called to account for it, and was screened and protected by some great men; but not long after, this inhuman

⁵ S. Basnage, *Ann.* iii. p. 570.

wretch was seized with racking pains in his bowels, and died in most miserable anguish ; and God, who suffered him to escape the punishment which his judges ought to have inflicted upon him, punished him himself in a severer manner."

41. A Roman Monk, called *John*, signalised himself at that time in persecuting these poor innocent people. "He invented a new kind of torment ; he put their legs into boots full of boiling tallow, and then, laughing at them, he asked them if they were not well equipped for their journey. Having heard that the Parliament of Aix, by orders from the King, had condemned him, he fled to Avignon ; where, being screened from men, and from human courts of justice, he could not escape divine vengeance. He was stripped of all his effects by his domestics, and reduced to a state of beggary : his body was covered all over with loathsome ulcers ; and he lived long in this horrible condition, often wishing for death, which came not, till he had endured dreadful torments." ⁶

42. Philip de Comines, who wrote the history of *Lewis the Eleventh* of France, could not avoid observing that the divine vengeance was conspicuous in returning to this most wicked Prince the evil which he had inflicted upon others, and in making his punishment suitable to his offences. Many memorable and striking instances of this kind might be produced from modern historians.

In the Scriptures there are examples of saints as well as of sinners, who suffered in this life according to the law of retaliation. St. Paul was consenting to the stoning of Stephen ; and, though God forgave him, yet he permitted him to be used by the Jews, as he and the Jews had used Stephen and other Christians ; and he was banished, imprisoned, beaten, scourged, and three times stoned.

It is observable that from the beginning of the reign of Tiberius down to Constantine, the Romans, even omitting the colleagues of the emperors, and those usurpers who set themselves up against them, had no less than *thirty-seven* emperors, whose reigns, one with another, amount only to *seven* years for each. Take the same space of time in the English History from William the Conqueror, and you have no more than *eleven* kings,

⁶ See Le Clerc, *Bibl. Ch.* xxvii. 1.

and their reigns will be of *twenty-seven* years, one with another. This very quick succession of the Roman emperors for the first three centuries; the violent and untimely death by which many of them perished; the empire often falling into the hands of persons not related to their predecessors, but their enemies and rivals, and not disposed to adopt their private views and animosities; was of singular advantage to Christianity, and made the persecutions less violent and less lasting than they would else have been, and may very reasonably be looked upon as providential.

Let us now see what the Prophets have delivered concerning these events.

The hundred and tenth Psalm is a direct and literal prophecy of Christ:—1. *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.* 2. *The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.* 3. *Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth.* 4. *The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedek.* 5. *The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath.* 6. *He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill the places with the dead bodies: he shall wound the heads over many countries.* 7. *He shall drink of the brook in the way; therefore shall he lift up his head.*

The second Psalm is of the same kind:—1. *Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?* 2. *The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed, saying,* 3. *Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.* 4. *He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision.* 5. *Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure.* 6. *Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.* 7. *I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.* 8. *Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.* 9. *Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.* 10. *Be wise now therefore, O ye*

kings : be instructed, ye judges of the earth. 11. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. 12. Kiss the son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little : blessed are all they that put their trust in him.

This Psalm seems in a lower sense applicable to David ; but it suits much better with the Messiah, especially when compared with *the hundred and tenth*, which is a key to it ; and the Apostles apply it to Christ. No person ever lived before David, and none ever yet arose after him, to whom the cxth Psalm could be applied, besides Jesus Christ.

David was a king ; he was a great and victorious king ; he was a king by divine election and appointment ; he was a prophet ; he was called *a man after God's own heart*, not because he was a better man than many of his subjects, for he was guilty of several faults, but because, as a king, he kept up the true religion, and made the laws of God to be observed in his dominions, and never fell into idolatry ; and upon all these accounts he could have no superior upon earth, none who could be his Lord. A great king, a promised Messiah was to arise ; but, as he was to be the son of David, he must have been in that respect inferior to his father ;⁷ and it seemed unnatural that David should pay homage to his own child. This difficulty our Saviour proposed to the Jews : they *could* not solve it, and he *would* not ; but his design was to intimate to them that the Messiah was a greater person than they apprehended, and that though he was inferior to David, as he was the son of David, he was superior to him, as he was the son of God.⁸ Besides, what relation could there be of *Lord* and *servant* between David and the Messiah, when David was dead, or before the Messiah was born ; unless the Messiah existed before his appearance upon earth, and were the Lord not only of the living, but of the dead, that is, of those who though dead to men, yet lived to him, and were his servants ? David therefore is to be thus understood ; *The Lord Jehovah hath said to my Lord the Messiah, Thou shalt*

⁷ This does not follow ; neither is it a necessary point to the argument. Christ was in no respect inferior to David ; though, had he spoken of him merely as his *son* or *descendant*, without reference to his Messiahship, he would scarcely have called him *Lord*. The student, however, will do well to compare Jortin with Horne and other commentators on the Psalm throughout.—EDIT. ⁸ Matt. xxii. 41, 46.

sit at my right hand, invested with divine power, and next in dignity to me.

In this Psalm there are some expressions which are ambiguous and obscure; but setting aside grammatical and critical difficulties, and attending to those parts of it which are plain, we find it foretold here that a person should arise, who should be greater than David, who should be a king, who should rule in the midst of his enemies, who should be an everlasting priest, and who by the assistance of God should overthrow kings and armies that opposed him. These predictions were evidently accomplished in Christ.

1. By comparing this Psalm with other prophecies, we may observe that the person here mentioned was to be the *son of David*. It has been universally agreed upon by Jews and Christians that the Messiah should be the son of David, for these reasons. God promised to David, not only that he should have a son to reign after him, but that the kingdom should be continued to his family. Thus in the first book of Samuel:⁹—*I will set up thy seed after thee; thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever.* In the Psalms:—*I have found David my servant; my mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him; his seed will I make to endure for ever.*¹ It is also declared: *I will make the horn of David to bud, I have ordained a lamp for mine anointed.*² Horn means a king, and the expression of budding is taken from trees, which shoot forth branches. Isaiah says:—*I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David.*³ That is, I will fulfil what I promised to David. And again:—*In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious.*⁴ *And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him.*⁵ This was said long after the death of David, so that the promised person was not yet come, but was to appear in future times. Afterwards Jeremiah thus prophesies:—*Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and*

⁹ 1 Sam. vii. 12.

¹ Psa. lxxxix. 20, 28, 29.

² cxxxii. 17.

³ Isai. lv. 3.

⁴ xi. 10.

⁵ xi. 1, 2.

*prosper, and shall execute justice and judgment in the earth. And this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness.*⁶ Zechariah, who prophesied after the return from the captivity, taught the people to expect a great person, *the servant of God, the Branch*, that is, the *Branch of Jesse*, the man whose name was *the Branch*, who should build the temple, and be a *king* and a *priest* upon the throne.⁷ Many other prophecies there are concurring in this, that a person should arise, who should be the son of David, and a great and illustrious Prince; and he is called *David* by Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.⁸ The most probable reason why the Messiah is called *David*, is that David was a type of him, and said many things seemingly of himself, which by the Spirit of God were intended of the Messiah. Either these prophecies were accomplished in Christ, or they never have been accomplished at all; but with Christ they correspond exactly.

2. The person mentioned in this Psalm was to be greater than David. This is too plain to want any further proof:—*The Lord said unto my Lord.* And this was accomplished in Christ, if he was, as we learn from the Gospel, the Son of God in a sense most peculiar and high.

3. He was to be a king. *Sit thou at my right hand: rule thou in the midst.* This also is evident; and it was accomplished in Christ, who has been acknowledged for a king by all his numerous subjects from his resurrection to the present time. To *sit at the right hand of God* cannot mean less than to be next in honour and dignity to God, and therefore to be exalted not only above all men, but above all creatures. This dignity was never conferred upon any man, except Christ; who, as the writers of the New Testament affirm, was received up into heaven, and was seen of Stephen appearing at the right hand of God. But, farther, it may be inferred from this Psalm that he was to be an *everlasting* king. It is said that he should be king and priest, and an everlasting priest, and consequently an everlasting king also. It is likewise said, *Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool*, which was never accomplished in any of David's posterity except in Christ; in whom so much of the prediction hath been fulfilled, as to be a suffi-

⁶ Jer. xxiii. 5. ⁷ Zech. vi. 12. ⁸ Hos. iii. 4, 5; Jer. xxx. 9; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24.

cient earnest for the completion of the whole promise. Hence St. Paul proves Christ's everlasting kingdom:—*Christ must reign, says he, till all things and all enemies are subdued and put under his feet.*⁹ This is not yet accomplished, nor will be till the end of the world; for he has and he will have his enemies who will not be subject to him; and besides, as he has promised to overcome Death and to confer everlasting life upon his servants, and as Death still reigns and will reign over them here below, during this state of things, his dominion will not be complete till Death is no more, and his servants are raised up by him, at the last day, to live with him for ever.

4. It is said, in the third verse, of this person, *From the womb of the morning thou hast the dew of thy youth;*¹—which words are obscure. The reading of the LXX. is very different and remarkable. *Before the morning star I begat thee:*—Ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε. If this be right,² which I take not upon me to determine, it contains an intimation that this great person was the Son of God before the creation, and in a high and peculiar sense, and not like other good men; and in the second Psalm, it is said, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.*

5. In the fourth verse, *Thou art a priest*³ *for ever after the order of Melchisedek*, might also be rendered, *Thou art a priest for ever, because thou art a just king.*⁴ But what interpretation soever be followed here, it is plain that he was to be an *everlasting* priest. *The Lord sware, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever.* This promise is introduced with great solemnity, and confirmed with an oath; and it is of a singular kind, since no such promise is made in the Old Testament to any other person. According to the system of the Gospel, it was accom-

⁹ 1 Cor. xv. 25, 27.

¹ A friend of mine says, *I render the words thus: From the womb, from that which was thy morning, thy youth was a dew, i.e., as agreeable and refreshing as dew is in hot countries. This is a literal version, and is sense.*

² See *Critical Notes on some passages of Scripture*, p. 54.

³ *Sacerdos, aut minister.* Grotius. *Vox Chohen* significat quidem interdum principem, eumque intimæ admissionis, ut diximus ad 2 Sam. viii. 18; 1 Reg. iv. 5. Sed de Rege proprie dicto nusquam occurrit. Ideoque LXX Intt. σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Quod Jesu Christo soli convenit.—*Clericus.*

⁴ See *Critical Notes*, &c. *Noster textus Hebræus habet, Secundum meam constitutionem, o Rex mi juste.*—Grotius.

plished in Christ, who is our everlasting Redeemer and Intercessor. The consequences of this promise were, that the Messiah must live for ever, and not be subject to the dominion of Death, else he could not be an everlasting priest; and that he could have no successor in the priesthood, since it would never be vacant; and that the Jewish Priesthood and the ceremonial law must be abolished, and give place to another institution and covenant; and that the priesthood must be changed, and pass from the family of Aaron and the tribe of Levi to the family of David, and to the tribe of Judah, whence this Messiah was to spring.

6. *The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.* When the Gospel of Christ, first preached at Jerusalem, and thence spreading itself through the world, had been received by a multitude of Jews and Gentiles, this prediction began to be accomplished; and it was farther fulfilled when Christianity was established in the Roman Empire.

7. In this Psalm it is plainly and expressly foretold that the Messiah should be a victorious king; that he should have kings and rulers for his enemies; and that they should be overthrown and perish. This, as we have shown, was remarkably fulfilled in Christ.

8. In the sixth verse, *He shall wound the heads over many countries*, may be translated, *he shall crush the head (that ruled) over many countries.*⁵

9. In the seventh verse, *He shall drink of the brook in the way; therefore shall he lift up his head.* That is, says Le Clerc, *He, who was head over many countries, shall drink of the brook in the way; therefore he (the conqueror) shall lift up his head:—Maxentius and his host shall be drowned in the Tiber, and lay his head there; and Constantine shall lift up his head, and triumph over him.* This Le Clerc proposes, but modestly and with diffidence. The thought is ingenious, and to drink of the brook may mean to be drowned, as in Homer:⁶—Ὡς ὁ μὲν ἐνθ' ἀπόλωλεν, ἐπεὶ πλεν ἀλμυρὸν ὕδωρ. So Ovid:⁷—*Neu bibat æquoreas naufragus hostis aquas.* But perhaps it would be more natural to under-

⁵ Confodiet caput quod multis terris præerat.—*Clericus.*

⁶ Odyss. Δ. 511.

⁷ Epist. vii. 62.

stand it thus of the same person : *As a pursuing conqueror takes a hasty draught at the first fountain in the way, and loses no time in refreshing himself; so God, or the Messiah, shall speedily subdue his enemies, and lift up his victorious head.* Soon after Diocletian began to persecute, the divine vengeance began to attack him and his wicked colleagues, and swept them off from the earth one after another.

We have shown the completion of these predictions in the establishment of Christianity, and in the destruction of those tyrants who rose up against it, and who became as the dung of the earth. It is no wonder that our Saviour and his apostles⁸ insisted so much on this Psalm, as on a prophecy, direct and plain; which, when it was accomplished, was so strong a proof of their divine mission, and of the authority both of the Old Testament and of the New. The Apostles have applied some parts of this Psalm to Christ, and they knew that the whole would be accomplished in him; yet in their discourses and writings they avoided a particular mention of the destruction which should fall upon the persecuting Princes, probably because they would not offend the Roman emperors, and give malicious men an opportunity of accusing the Christians as bad subjects, and as enemies to the government.

But we will not dissemble another interpretation which has been given of this Psalm. "It was made, say they, by David, for the use of the people; of his subjects, who were to rehearse it in the house of God, at the tabernacle. It relates in its primary sense to David, and the meaning of the first verse is, *The Lord Jehovah hath said to my Lord* (king David), *Sit thou, &c.* It is true that David was no priest; but the word *Chohen* is ambiguous, and may mean either a priest, or an intimate friend of the king, who has free admission to his presence; one of the great courtiers:—according to which sense the fourth verse may be interpreted, *Thou art of all the sons of men, my principal favourite, who hast free access to me.* But then this Psalm, like many other prophecies, has a double sense, and is applicable to the Messiah, and is much more eminently accomplished in him than it ever was in David." This interpretation has been proposed and adopted by Ruarus, and by some other Socinians.⁹

⁸ Matt. xxii. 44 ; Mark xii. 36 ; Luke xx. 42 ; Acts ii. 34 ; 1 Cor. xv. 25 ; Hebr. i. 13. v. 6. vii. 17.

⁹ See Ruari Epist. T. ii. p. 116.

Now, if we should admit this double sense, yet it must be observed that Christ applied this Psalm to himself; that the Apostles applied it to him; and that their interpretation was fully justified by a long train of various events, and by the accomplishment of the whole prediction in Christ, which is an irrefragable proof that they understood it rightly. But there is no admitting this double meaning without adopting a precarious hypothesis, contradicting the general opinion of the Jews in the time of Christ; rejecting the version of the LXX., which translates *Chohen*, ἱερεὺς, according to the usual sense of the word; and offering violence to some parts of the Psalm, which cannot be applied to David unless in a sense very low and flat, *sensu valde diluto*. David could not say of himself, *The Lord said unto my Lord*; nor did he sit at the right hand of God, exalted above men and angels; nor were all his enemies subdued under his feet; nor did they whom he conquered pay him a willing obedience; nor was he an everlasting priest, or an everlasting king; nor was his dominion extensive over the nations and the Gentiles.¹

XXXIII. OF THE CONDITION OF THE JEWS SINCE THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

THE condition of the *Jews* under *Constantine* should now be considered; but I shall take the subject from an earlier date, and offer a few remarks on the state of that people from the destruction of Jerusalem to this day.²

“However unentertaining the history may seem to be, which we have undertaken, yet it presents to the public view

¹ Davidis revera fuisse Psalmum testatur Christus, et Petrus. Uterque ostendit, vi verborum, de Christo agi, non de alio; qua in re non aptantur ei verba, quæ et alii convenire queant, ut interdum fit in vaticiniis, sed statuuntur non aliter posse intelligi.—Hoc unum non facile cuiquam concessero, hunc Psalmum non ad Jesum Christum solum et quidem directe referri oportere; quod nec diffitebatur H. Grotius, qui cæteroquin insimulatur, quasi vix ullam prophetiam directe ad Christum solum pertinere fassus sit. Quod tamen immerito viro magno objicitur.—*Clericus*. See his comment on this Psalm.

² Those who would enter more fully into this interesting historical detail, will do well to peruse *Professor Stowe's Appendix to Jahn's History of the Hebrew Commonwealth*. The work is reprinted in Ward's *Library of Standard Divinity*; a series containing many valuable re-publications, with others of a more questionable tendency.—EDIT.

an object worthy of observation, and the greatest prodigy that can be imagined ; namely, the preservation of the Jewish people in the midst of the miseries which they have undergone since seventeen hundred years. Religions depend on temporal prosperity ; they triumph under the protection of a conqueror ; they languish and sink with sinking monarchies. Paganism, which once covered the face of the earth, is extinct. The Christian Church, glorious in its martyrs, yet was considerably diminished by the persecutions to which it was exposed ; nor was it easy to repair the breaches in it made by those acts of violence. But here we behold a church hated and persecuted for seventeen hundred ages, and yet sustaining itself, and widely extended. Kings have often employed the severity of edicts, and the hand of executioners, to ruin it. The seditious multitudes, by murders and massacres, have committed outrages against it still more violent and tragical. Princes and people, Pagans, Mohammedans, Christians, disagreeing in so many things, have united in the design of exterminating it, and have not been able to succeed. The *bush of Moses*, surrounded with flames, ever burns, and is never consumed. The Jews have been expelled, in different times, from every part of the world, which has only served to spread them in all regions. From age to age they have been exposed to misery and persecution : yet still they subsist, in spite of the ignominy and the hatred which has pursued them in all places, whilst the greatest monarchies are fallen, and nothing remains of them besides the name.

“ Their misery bears its peculiar characters. In their other captivities, God marked out a time in which he would be propitious, and break the yoke of tyranny, and restore to them their lost liberty. The longest, which was the Egyptian captivity, yet lasted only a few ages. After threescore and ten years they returned from Babylon, and the persecution of Antiochus was to cease after three years and ten days : but of their present evils God has not fixed the expiration.—God comforted them under their other distresses by heroes, or by inspired men. Ezekiel prophesied at Babylon ; and Daniel, long before the event, pointed out the Messiah. The Maccabees arose against the kings of Syria, and raised up the fallen glory of the nation ; but hitherto none have appeared, besides false Messiahs, who, by their attempts to shake off the yoke from the people, have

only increased its weight. The prophetic succession is extinct; and no sacred messenger arises to promise the end of miseries which have lasted so many ages.

“Even when God delivered them up to infidels, he preserved a body of the nation, by removing it to one place. It was entire in the vale of Goshen, when they were called out of Egypt. Cyrus easily reunited the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, to send them back to Jerusalem. One part of the nation inhabited the same cities, and the Israelites occupied the two borders of the river Chabor; but at the destruction of Jerusalem, and afterwards in Adrian’s war, the nation, enfeebled by unparalleled massacres, was dispersed through all the provinces of the empire. The dispersion is as great as it ever was, and scarcely are to be found the remains of the ten tribes in the east, where formerly they were numerous and considerable.

“The Romans, when they made themselves masters of Judea, left to its inhabitants a public worship, and the exercise of their laws. The synagogues, as those of Damascus, judged with authority of religious affairs, in which even the Christians were interested. The high priest was not without power. There were judges even in Chaldea, as it appears from the history of Susanna, false as it is. But not the shadow of sovereign authority now remains, and yet the nation remains, and consists of millions.

“The judgments which God has exercised upon this people are terrible, extending to the men, the religion, and the very land in which they dwelt. The ceremonies essential to their religion can no more be observed. The ritual law, which cast a splendour on the national worship, and struck the Pagans so much that they sent their presents and their victims to Jerusalem, is absolutely fallen; for they have no temple, no altar, no sacrifices.—Their land itself seems to lie under a never-ceasing curse. Pagans, Christians, Mohammedans, in a word almost all nations, have by turns seized, and held Jerusalem. To the Jew only has God refused the possession of this small tract of ground so supremely necessary for him, since he ought to worship on this mountain. A Jewish writer³ has affirmed, that it is long since any Jew was seen settled near Jerusalem:

³ Julian of Toledo. See his Treatise *contra Indicos*; ap. Biblioth. Max. Patr. T. xii. p. 632.—EDIT.

scarcely can they purchase there six feet of land for a burying-place.

“ In all this there is no exaggeration. I am only pointing out known facts ; and, far from having the least design to raise an odium against the nation from its miseries, I conclude that it ought to be looked upon as one of those prodigies which we admire without comprehending : since in spite of evils so durable, and a patience so long exercised, it is preserved by a particular providence. The Jew ought to be weary of expecting a Messiah, who so unkindly disappoints his vain hopes ; and the Christian ought to have his attention and his regard excited towards men, whom God preserves, for so great a length of time, under calamities which would have been the total ruin of any other people.”⁴

Some have observed that the preservation of the *Gypsies* is as extraordinary as that of the *Jews* ; but this is thrown out by way of *jest*, which, like *gravity* and *solemnity* in another sort of writers, often supplies the want of argument. For what comparison between the Jewish nation, and a collection of strollers of various countries, who perhaps have not existed, as a body, above four hundred years ; who, far from dogmatising, seem to be of no religion at all ; who never appeared in arms, and made themselves formidable ; whom rags and contempt have secured from violent persecution ; and who, at the worst, have been only driven from place to place, which to them was no great punishment for frauds and petty-larcenies ?⁵

T. Jackson, in his theological works,⁶ has given a summary account of the calamities of the Jews from the time of their rebellion against Christ ; but he has not shown the candour and the caution of Basnage : he is prejudiced against them, treats them over severely, judges too harshly, and pays too much regard to the ridiculous stories and lying slanders, which have been raised by Christians against them. One would wonder how zeal could transport a good and learned man to such a degree against this miserable nation.

Our Saviour said to the Jews, *I am come in my Father's name,*

⁴ Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, iv. 1.

⁵ The *Gypsies* are, nevertheless, a most remarkable and interesting race ; and a theory has been started, which is by no means unworthy of consideration, regarding them as a remnant of the *ten* lost tribes of Israel.—EDIT.

⁶ Vol. i. p. 92, &c.

and ye receive me not : if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.' This remarkable prediction of our Lord has been evidently and frequently fulfilled : for, in the interval between the resurrection of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem, many *false Christs and false prophets* arose, of whom mention is made by St. Luke and by Josephus.⁷

In the reign of Adrian, *Barcohab* pretended to be the Messiah, and perished with his followers.⁸ In the time of Theodosius the younger (A.D. 434), another impostor arose, called *Moses Cretensis*. He pretended to be a second Moses, sent to deliver the Jews who dwelt in Crete, and promised to divide the sea, and give them a safe passage through it. They assembled together, with their wives and children, and followed him to a promontory. He there commanded them to cast themselves into the sea. Many of them readily obeyed him, and perished in the waters ; and many were taken up and saved by fishermen. Upon this, the deluded Jews would have torn the impostor to pieces ; but he escaped them, and was seen no more.¹ Socrates relates here a story of what happened in his own days. He says not that this fellow wrought any miracles to bewitch his countrymen ; unless it be supposed a sort of *miracle*, to make a Jew fling away himself, and his money too. It is plain that the impostor could propose neither profit nor credit by thus deluding and destroying the Jews ; and therefore we may conclude that he was a frantic enthusiast, and that perhaps, in the hurry and bustle, he jumped down himself unseen, and was drowned.

In the reign of Justin (A.D. 520), another false prophet is said to have appeared, and to have called himself the son of Moses. His name was *Dunaan*. He entered into a city of Arabia Felix, and there he oppressed the Christians ; but he was taken prisoner and put to death by Elesban, an Ethiopian General.²

The Jews and Samaritans of Palestine rebelled against the Emperor Justinian (A.D. 529), and set up one *Julian* for their

⁷ John v. 43.

⁸ Acts v. 36, 37 ; viii. 9. Joseph. B. J. i. Pr. ii. 13, 4, 5. Ant. xx. 4, 1 ; 7, 10.

⁹ See at p. 473.

¹ Socrat. E. H. vii. 38. ἀφανὴς γὰρ ἐγένετο.

² See a fuller account of this *Dunaan*, in Fleury (H. E. t. vii. p. 272) ; and in Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs* (vi. 20, p. 1375), who says that *Dunaan* was no false Messiah, but a king of the Homerites.

king, and accounted him the Messiah ; but the Romans made a great slaughter of them, and their king was killed.³ This rebellion is to be ascribed to the Samaritans, who were oppressed on account of their religion by Justinian, a wrong-headed prince, and a great persecutor of heretics.⁴

A.D. 571. *Mohammed* was born in Arabia. He at first professed himself to be the Messiah who was promised to the Jews ; and he drew after him many of them ; and so may claim a place in the catalogue of *false Christs*.

A.D. 721. Another *impostor*, a Syrian, arose in the time of *Leo Isaurus*. He called himself the Messiah, and was received as such by the Jews.

A.D. 1137. A *false Christ* made his appearance in France. He was put to death, and many Jews suffered at the same time, being accused of crucifying a Christian boy once a year.

A.D. 1138. The Persians were disturbed by a Jew, who called himself *the Messiah*, and collected a formidable army of his countrymen. The Persian king submitted to compound the matter with him, and hired him to disband his soldiers. But afterwards he seized and beheaded him, and made the Jews in his dominions pay him back all the money which he had given to their Messiah ; by which they were reduced to a state of beggary, and to a necessity of selling their children. He continued to treat them very cruelly, and subjected them to all kinds of insults. In the same century (A.D. 1157), a *false Messiah* stirred up the Jews at Corduba, in Spain ; upon which almost all the Jews of that kingdom were destroyed.

A.D. 1167. *Another* arose in the kingdom of Fez, who is mentioned by Maimonides. In the same year appeared a *false prophet*, and, as it seems, an enthusiast also : it was in Arabia. He pretended to be the forerunner of the Messiah. When search was made for him, his followers fled, and he was brought before the Arabian king. He was questioned by him, and replied that he was indeed a prophet sent from God. The king then asked him what sign or miracle he could show, to confirm his mission. Cut off my head, said he, and I will return to life again. The king took him at his word, promising to believe in him if it came to pass, and cut off his head. But the prophet

³ John a Lent.

⁴ See Fleury, H. E. T. vii. p. 326.

never attempted to fasten it on again ; and the Jews of Arabia had a heavy fine laid upon them. Yet some of them, says Maimonides, were so infatuated as to expect his resurrection. Not long after this, a Jew, who dwelt beyond Euphrates, called himself *the Messiah*, and gave this for a sign of it, that he was leprous all night, and clean all day. He perished in his attempt.

A.D. 1174. A *magician* and false Christ was seen in Persia, who brought the Jews into great tribulation.

A.D. 1176. Another arose in Moravia, who was called *David Almusser*. He pretended that he could make himself invisible ; but he was taken, and put to death, and a heavy fine was laid upon his brethren, the Jews. Solomon Ben Virgæ mentions another *impostor* ; but we know not in what year, or in what place, he set up his claim.

A.D. 1199. A famous cheat and a rebel exerted himself in Persia, called *David el David*, or *David Alroi* ; a learned man, and a magician, who is reported to have wrought many miracles. He raised an army against the king, but was taken and imprisoned, and, having escaped, was again seized, and was beheaded. Benjamin Tudelensis and Solomon Ben Virgæ have given us an account, abounding with lies, concerning the wonders wrought by this enchanter.

A.D. 1497. We find another Messiah, whose name was *Ismael Sophus*, who deluded the Jews in Spain.

A.D. 1500. *Rabbi Lemlem*, a German Jew of Austria, declared himself a forerunner of the Messiah, and pulled down his own oven, promising his brethren that they should bake their bread in the Holy Land the next year.

A.D. 1509. Jo. Henricus Majus, in his life of Reuchlin, says that one *Pfefferkorn*, a Jew of Cologne, pretended to be the Messiah. *Pfefferkorn* afterwards turned Christian, and joined with James Hochstrat, an inquisitor, and a man thoroughly qualified for his vile office, to plague the Jews and to persecute Reuchlin. This quarrel excited some wit to write the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* ; in which Hochstrat, and his stupid monks and doctors, are set in a ridiculous light, and make a very droll figure.⁵

A.D. 1534. In Spain, *Rabbi Salomo Malcho*, giving out that

⁵ Bayle gives an account of these disputes in his *Dict.* under HOCHSTRAT.

he was the Messiah, was burnt by Charles the Fifth; and the Christians were so superstitious, that they stopped the Rabbi's mouth, when they brought him to the stake, lest, by uttering some charm, he should escape out of their hands. The poor wretch was a sort of martyr, for it is said that he might have saved his life, if he would have renounced Judaism.

A. D. 1615. A *false Christ* arose in the East Indies, and was followed by the Portuguese Jews.

A. D. 1624. Another, in the Low Countries, pretended to be *the Messiah*, of the family of David, and of the line of Nathan. He promised to destroy Rome, and to overthrow the kingdom of Antichrist, and the Turkish empire.

"A. D. 1666. This was a year of great expectation, and some wonderful thing was looked for by many. This was a fit time for an impostor to set up; and accordingly lying reports were carried about. It was told about that great multitudes marched from unknown parts to the remote deserts of Arabia, and they were supposed to be the ten tribes of Israel, who have been dispersed for many ages; that a ship was arrived in the north parts of Scotland with sails and cordage of silk; that the mariners spake nothing but Hebrew; that on the sails was this motto, THE TWELVE TRIBES OF ISRAEL. Thus were credulous men possessed at that time. Then it was that *Sabatai Sevi* appeared at Smyrna, and professed himself to be the Messiah. He promised the Jews deliverance and a prosperous kingdom. This which he promised they firmly believed. The Jews now attended to no business, discoursed of nothing but of their return, and believed Sabatai to be the Messiah as firmly as we Christians believe any article of faith. A right reverend person, then in Turkey, told me that meeting with a Jew of his acquaintance at Aleppo, he asked him what he thought of Sabatai. The Jew replied, that he believed him to be the Messiah, and that he was so far of that belief, that, if he should prove an impostor, he would then turn Christian. It will be very fit I should be very particular in this relation, because the history is so very surprising and remarkable; and we have the account of it from those who were then in Turkey, and are now alive. I am so well satisfied as to the facts, that I dare vouch for the truth of the

relation, and appeal for the truth of it to very many persons of great credit, who are now alive.

“*Sabatai Sevi* was the son of *Mordecai Sevi*, a mean Jew of Smyrna. Sabatai was very bookish, and arrived to a great skill in the Hebrew learning. He was the author of a new doctrine, and for it was expelled the city. He went thence to *Salonichi*, of old called *Thessalonica*, where he married a very handsome woman, but was divorced from her. Then he travelled into the Morea; then to Tripoli, Gaza, and Jerusalem. By the way he picked up a third wife. At Jerusalem he began to reform the Jews' constitutions, and abolished one of their solemn fasts, and communicated his design of professing himself the Messiah to one Nathan. He was pleased with it, and set up for his *Elias* or forerunner, and took upon him to abolish all the Jewish fasts, as not befitting, when the bridegroom was now come. Nathan prophesied that the Messiah should appear before the grand seignior in less than two years, and take from him his crown, and lead him in chains. At Gaza, Sabatai preached repentance, together with a faith in himself, so effectually, that the people gave themselves up to their devotions and alms. The noise of this Messiah began to fill all places. Sabatai now resolves for Smyrna, and then for Constantinople. Nathan writes to him from Damascus; and thus he begins his letter:—*To the King, our king, Lord of Lords, who gathers the dispersed of Israel, who redeems our captivity, the man elevated to the height of all sublimity, the Messiah of the God of Jacob, the true Messiah, the celestial Lion, Sabatai Sevi.*

“And now throughout Turkey the Jews were in great expectation of glorious times. They now were devout and penitent, that they might not obstruct the good which they hoped for. Some fasted so long, that they were famished to death; others buried themselves in the earth till their limbs grew stiff; some would endure melting wax dropped on their flesh; some rolled in snow; others in a cold season would put themselves into cold water; and many whipped themselves. Business was laid aside; superfluities of household utensils were sold; the poor were provided for by immense contributions. Sabatai comes to Smyrna, where he was adored by the people, though the *Chacham* contradicted him, for which he was removed from his office. There he

in writing styles himself *the only and first-born Son of God, the Messiah, the Saviour of Israel*. And though he met with some opposition, yet he prevailed there at last, to that degree, that some of his followers prophesied, and fell into strange ecstasies; four hundred men and women prophesied of his growing kingdom; and young infants who could hardly speak, would plainly pronounce *Sabatai, Messiah, and Son of God*. The people were for a time possessed, and voices heard from their bowels; some fell into trances, foamed at the mouth, recounted their future prosperity, their visions of the Lion of Judah, and the triumphs of Sabatai. All which, says the relator, were certainly true, being effects of diabolical delusions, as the Jews themselves have since confessed unto me.

“Now the impostor swells and assumes. Whereas the Jews in their synagogues were wont to pray for the grand seignior, he orders those prayers to be forborne for the future, thinking it an indecent thing to pray for him who was shortly to be his captive; and instead of praying for the Turkish emperor, he appoints prayers for himself, as another author relates. And, as my author, *Joannes a Lent*, goes on, he elected princes to govern the Jews in their march towards the Holy Land, and to minister justice to them when they should be possessed of it. These princes were men well known in the city of Smyrna at that time. The people now were pressing to see some miracle to confirm their faith, and to convince the Gentiles. Here the impostor was puzzled, though any juggling trick would have served their turn. But the credulous people supplied this defect. When Sabatai was before the Cadi, or justice of peace, some affirmed they saw a pillar of fire between him and the Cadi; and after some had affirmed it, others were ready to swear it, and did swear it also; and this was presently believed by the Jews of that city. He that did not now believe him to be the Messiah, was to be shunned as an excommunicate person. The impostor now declares that he was called of God to see Constantinople, where he had much to do. He ships himself, to that end, in a Turkish *saick*, in Jan. 1666. He had a long and troublesome voyage: he had not power over the sea and winds. The vizier, upon the news, sends for him, and confines him to a loathsome prison. The Jews pay him their visits; and they of

this city are now as infatuated as those of Smyrna. They forbid traffic, and refused to pay their debts. Some of our English merchants, not knowing how to recover their debts from the Jews, took this occasion to visit Sabatai, and make their complaints to him against his subjects; whereupon he wrote this following letter to the Jews:—*To you of the nation of the Jews, who expect the appearance of the Messiah, and the salvation of Israel, peace without end. Whereas we are informed that you are indebted to several of the English nation, it seemeth right unto us to order you to make satisfaction to these your just debts; which if you refuse to do, and not obey us herein, know you that then you are not to enter with us into our joys and dominions.*

“Sabatai remained a prisoner in Constantinople by the space of two months. The grand vizier, designing for Candia, thought it not safe to leave him in the city, during the grand seignior's absence and his own. He therefore removed him to the *Dardanelli*; a better air indeed, but yet out of the way, and consequently importing less danger to the city; which occasioned the Jews to conclude that the Turks could not, or durst not take away his life; which had, they concluded, been the surest way to have removed all jealousy. The Jews flocked in great numbers to the castle where he was a prisoner; not only those that were near, but from Poland, Germany, Leghorn, Venice, and other places: they received Sabatai's blessing, and promises of advancement. The Turks made use of this confluence; they raised the price of their lodgings and provisions, and put their price upon those, who desired to see Sabatai, for their admittance. This profit stopped their mouths, and no complaints were for this cause sent to Adrianople.

“Sabatai, in this confinement, appoints the manner of celebrating his own nativity. He commands the Jews to keep it on the ninth day of the month *Ab*, and to make it a day of great joy; to celebrate it with pleasing meats and drinks, with illuminations and music. He obliges them to acknowledge the love of God in giving them that day of consolation for the birth of their king Messiah, Sabatai Sevi, his servant and first-born son in love. I only observe by the way the insolence of this impostor. This day was a solemn day of fasting among the Jews formerly, as I have shown elsewhere, in memory of the burning of the

temple by the Chaldees. Several other sad things happened in this month, as the Jews observe ; that then and upon the same day the second temple was destroyed ; and that in this month it was decreed in the wilderness that the Israelites should not enter into Canaan. Sabatai was born on this day ; and therefore the fast must be turned into a feast : whereas in truth, it had been well for the Jews had he not been born at all ; and much better for himself, as will appear from what follows. But I return to my author.

“ The Jews of the city paid Sabatai Sevi great respect. They decked their synagogues with S. S. in letters of gold, and made for him in the wall a crown ; they attributed the same titles and prophecies to him, which we apply to our Saviour.

“ He was also during this imprisonment visited by pilgrims from all parts, that had heard his story. Among whom *Nehemiah Cohen*, from Poland, was one ;—a man of great learning in the Cabala and Eastern tongues, who desired a conference with Sabatai, and at the conference maintained that, according to the Scripture, there ought to be a twofold Messiah : one, the son of Ephraim, a poor and despised teacher of the law ; the other, the son of David, to be a conqueror. Nehemiah was content to be the former, the son of Ephraim, and to leave the glory and dignity of the latter to Sabatai. Sabatai, for what appears, did not dislike this. But here lay the ground of the quarrel. Nehemiah taught that the son of Ephraim ought to be the forerunner of the son of David, and to usher him in : and Nehemiah accused Sabatai of too great forwardness, in appearing as the son of David, before the son of Ephraim had led him the way. Sabatai could not brook this doctrine ; for he might fear that the son of Ephraim, who was to lead the way, might pretend to be the son of David, and so leave him in the lurch : and therefore he excluded him from any part or share in this matter ; which was the occasion of the ruin of Sabatai, and all his glorious designs.

“ Nehemiah, being disappointed, goes to Adrianople, and informs the great ministers of state against Sabatai, as a lewd and a dangerous person to the government ; and that it was necessary to take him out of the way. The grand seignior, being informed of this, sends for Sabatai ; who, much dejected, appears before him. The grand seignior requires a miracle, and chooses

one himself, and it was this :—that Sabatai should be stripped naked, and set as a mark for his archers to shoot at ; and if the arrows did not pierce his flesh, he would own him to be the Messiah. Sabatai had not faith enough to bear up under so great a trial. The grand seignior let him know that he would forthwith impale him, and that the stake was prepared for him, unless he would turn Turk. Upon which he consented to turn Mahometan, to the great confusion of the Jews. And yet some of the Jews were so vain as to affirm that it was not Sabatai himself, but his shadow, that professed the religion, and was seen in the habit of a Turk. So great was their obstinacy and infidelity, as if it were a thing impossible to convince these deluded and infatuated wretches.

“ After all this, several of the Jews continued to use the forms, in their public worship, prescribed by this Mahometan Messiah ; which obliged the principal Jews of Constantinople to send to the synagogue of Smyrna, to forbid this practice. During these things, the Jews, instead of minding their trade and traffic, filled their letters with news of Sabatai, their Messiah, and his wonderful works. They reported that when the Grand Seignior sent to take him, he caused all the messengers that were sent, to die ; and that when other Janizaries were sent, they all fell dead by a word of his mouth ; and, being requested to do it, that he caused them to revive again. They added, that though the prison, where Sabatai lay, was barred and fastened with strong iron locks, yet he was seen to walk through the streets with a numerous train ; that the shackles which were upon his neck and feet did not only fall off, but were turned into gold, with which Sabatai gratified his followers. Upon the fame of these things, the Jews of Italy sent legates to Smyrna, to inquire into the truth of these matters. When the legates arrived at Smyrna, they heard of the news that Sabatai was turned Turk, to their very great confusion : but, going to visit the brother of Sabatai, he endeavoured to persuade them that Sabatai was still the true Messiah ; that it was not Sabatai that went about in the habit of a Turk, but his angel or spirit ; that his body was taken into heaven, and should be sent down again, when God should think it a fit season. He added that Nathan, his forerunner, who had wrought many miracles, would soon be

at Smyrna; that he would reveal hidden things to them, and confirm them. But this Elias was not suffered to come into Smyrna; and though the legates saw him elsewhere, they received no satisfaction from him at all.

“There appeared another impostor in the year 1682:—one *Rabbi Mordecai*, a Jew of Germany, a man famous among his countrymen, for his learning and austere kind of life. He was also much cried up for his prophecies, which he uttered about five years before, at Prague and other places. He was a very sharp reprover of vice, and was for that reason commonly called *Mochiah*, i. e. *the reprover*. He was so vain as to profess himself to be the Messiah; and not only to require the Jews to salute him as such, but upon the matter to adore him. The Italian Jews gave him credit, and so did many of the Jews of Germany also, whither he came out of Italy. We are told that he was mightily caressed in Italy, and received for the Messiah; though the Jews of that place, after they saw their error, did not care to own him. A certain Jew, that by order of the Jews called him into Italy, tells us, that, upon conversing with him, he found him to be an enchanter, and very silly; that he thereupon warned the Jews not to believe him: upon which the credulous Jews were so enraged that they treated their monitor very maliciously, and dismissed him from the place of his abode. They withal threatened him very severely, if he durst speak evil any more of their Messiah. Still this Jew continuing to disparage the impostor, the Italian Jews were so enraged, that they endeavoured to cast him out of the place where he was settled, and declared that whosoever should do him mischief, or bear false witness against this person, who defamed their Messiah, should be esteemed guiltless.”⁶

With *Rabbi Mordecai* ends the history of the false Messiahs; and the Jews, I think, have had none since. It may seem

⁶ *Kidder*.—*Joannes a Lent* wrote a *Schediasma de Judæorum Pseudo-Messias*. Bishop *Kidder* treated the same subject in his *Demonstration of the Messias*, and made use of this *Schediasma*; and I have borrowed from them both. *Kidder*’s book contains much useful erudition delivered in a slovenly and plebeian style, as may be seen in this specimen. *De La Croix*, in his *Relation of the Othoman Empire*, has also given us an ample account, and many curious and entertaining particularities of *Sabatai Sevi*, who, when he had apostatised, preached at Constantinople, and drew over many Jews to profess Mohammedism. At last he was committed to prison for the rest of his days, and died A.D. 1679. *La Croix* saw him, and heard him preach.

strange that they should have rejected Christ, who gave them so many proofs of his mission, and yet should follow every impostor, who pretended to be the Messiah, without offering any sufficient or even plausible evidence of it. The reason is plain. Our Saviour, by not setting up a temporal kingdom, dashed all their worldly views at once; but the other claimers of the title of *Messiah* began with promises of delivering them from their enemies, and restoring to them their country and their lost liberties.

Let us go back to the destruction of Jerusalem by Vespasian and Titus. The Jews, who escaped this slaughter, remained in a poor condition, in various parts of the Roman Empire.⁷ *Is autem, qui in Judæa remanserant, Titus imperavit, ut nullus sabbatum deinceps servaret; nullus a menstruata muliere se contineret, quemadmodum ex tractatu Talmudico Megilla clarum est.*⁸ Was ever anything so absurd? And who, but a *Talmudist* or a *Cabalist*, could take it into his silly head to conceive that Titus would have published such a decree, to plague the poor Jews? *Atque equidem, tum etiam si nolit, cogam ut cum illa una cubet.*⁹ This good-natured emperor was so far from persecuting, that he pitied and protected them; and when he was at Antioch, and the people there earnestly importuned him to banish the Jews from that city, he checked them, and said, "Where would you have these unhappy men go? They have now no country and city of their own to receive them."¹

Domitian succeeded Titus, and was a cruel and worthless prince, who oppressed all his subjects, but particularly the Jews. He imposed heavy tributes upon them, which they were ill able to pay, and exacted them with great rigour and insolence.

After this, in the time of Trajan, the Jews grew weary of their dependency and of the Roman yoke, and raised a rebellion in Libya, Egypt, Cyprus, and Mesopotamia; they exercised all sorts of iniquities and cruelties, and slew an innumerable multitude of people. If they had not been infatuated, they would

⁷ Concerning the state of the Jews from the destruction of Jerusalem to the end of the fifth century, their ecclesiastical government, their colleges, their Talmud or Deuteroses, their rabbins, doctors, patriarchs, and apostles, there are some curious remarks in Pezron (*Défense de l'Antiquité des Temps*).

⁸ John a Lent.

⁹ Terent. *Adelph.* v. 3.

¹ Joseph. B. J. vii. 5.

never have chosen such a time to rebel; when the Romans had one of the greatest, bravest, and wisest emperors that ever reigned, who understood war perfectly, and who loved it too much; for with many accomplishments he had that defect. This revolt brought on a war between the Jews and Romans: battles were fought, and the Jews were beaten, and severely punished.

After Trajan, Adrian was emperor, who also was a great and powerful prince, and who took care to maintain numerous and disciplined forces. Under him the Jews rebelled again in Palestine, headed by one *Barcohab*, an impostor and a false prophet, who was a robber and a murderer, and ravaged the country, and did incredible mischief. Encouraged by this villain, the Jews drew together and attempted to settle at Jerusalem, whereby they provoked Adrian to send an army against them, which took Jerusalem and destroyed it down to the ground a second time, and slew all the Jews that were to be found, not sparing even the infants. If we may believe the Jewish writers, their nation at that time suffered calamities not less severe nor less extensive than those under Vespasian. It is said that there died by sword, famine, sickness, and fire, five hundred and eighty thousand persons. The surviving Jews were sold in the markets, like beasts, to any who would purchase them, for a small price. When this war was thus ended, Adrian forbid all the Jews on pain of death to set foot in Jerusalem. It is said by some ancient writers, that once a year they purchased leave to approach their old city, and there to fast and weep over its ruins. Adrian then rebuilt a city near the place where Jerusalem stood, gave it a new name, peopled it with Pagans, and made it a Roman colony.

It appears from some passages in history that not long after this, under Antoninus Pius, the Jews rose and rebelled again, and were repressed. It is astonishing how, after so many calamities, they should have had the resolution and the strength to appear in arms.

Under his successor Marcus Aurelius, one of the best emperors that ever lived, they were so foolish and infatuated as to join themselves to a base worthless rebel, who rose up against so good a master; but the emperor forgave them, and showed them more mercy than they deserved.

Under Severus they were troublesome, and did something

that provoked him to make war against them, in which he had the advantage. This emperor, who was of a cruel disposition, published a rigid edict against them, and threatened to punish any of his subjects who should embrace their religion.

The conversion of Constantine produced a great revolution, by which Christianity became the established religion. And now the Jews were subject to Christian, as they had been before to Pagan emperors; but this revolution brought with it no advantage to them: it was rather a detriment. "The Jews were not much happier under Christian emperors, than they had been under the reign of idolaters. Their condition varied according to the temper of their rulers. Christians had suffered so much from persecution, that they could not instantly change their maxims and their notions about it. Constantine contented himself with making some laws which laid some restraint on the liberty of the Jews, though they were the objects of his hatred: but the Christians insensibly followed the bent of corrupted nature, which inclines us to torment and punish those who contradict us in matters of religion. Even the councils, which ought to have been more equitable, gave into this spirit, and became the incendiaries which inflamed the princes against the poor remains of this unhappy nation. We often make our boasts of the prevailing influence of humanity, and imagine that the dictates of nature suffice to teach us compassion for our fellow-creatures. But pride is another principle in us, which is more prevalent than compassion; and pride excites our indignation when we see a body of persons who think differently from us, and who assume the liberty to dispute against those truths of which we judge ourselves to be in possession. Humanity speaks first, and pleads for gentleness and forbearance; but pride bids her be silent, and hardens the heart against these softer impressions. Thus persecutions arise in every religion; whilst the teachers are inclined to look upon all opposition made to the doctrines of which they are the expounders and the defenders, as so many personal attacks upon themselves. Hence councils often authorise and begin those oppressions, which princes afterwards carry to the utmost rage and excess."²

² Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, vi. 14. The Council of Toledo (A.D. 633) made a cruel decree, that all the children of Jews should be taken away from their parents and

“The first event to be found in the life of Constantine, relating to the Jews, is reported by Zonaras. This historian informs us that they had a conference at Rome with Helena, the mother of Constantine, who was not yet converted. They represented to this princess, that, if her son had done well in abolishing Paganism and its idols, he was not much nearer to salvation; since, instead of worshipping the heroes of Pagan antiquity, he adored a man who had been crucified in later times. Helena, who was religious, and disquieted on account of her son, obliged the Jewish doctors to hold a conference with Pope Silvester, who soon triumphed over these enemies of Christianity. But whilst they were disputing, a magician called *Zambres*, whom the Rabbins had brought with them, caused an ox to fall down dead at the foot of Silvester. The miracle disconcerted not the prelate, for he raised the ox to life; and then all the persons present, acknowledging in the Pope a power superior to that of the magician, received baptism, and Helena also desired to be instructed in the faith. This is the story of a monk: but as there are in the world persons of all sorts, and understandings of all sizes, if any should be found credulous enough to digest this conference, this miracle, and the sudden conversion that followed it, he may have recourse to the authority of an Arabian historian, who assures us that twelve thousand Jews and Pagans, without counting women and children, received baptism at Rome under the reign of Constantine. Abulpharagius indeed speaks not of the miracle; but by tacking together the account of the Arab, and that of the Greek monk, the latter event may be looked upon as the consequence of the former, and the conversion of so great a number as a proof and an effect of the resurrection of the ox.”³ It is to be supposed that the magician whispered in the ear of the ox the *ineffable name*, which struck him dead; and it is a wonder that Zonaras did not think of it. Perhaps the name of this magician should be not *Zambres*, but *Jambres*, who must have been an old man indeed, if he was the same that *contended with Moses*.⁴

The zeal which Constantine had for Christianity set him put into monasteries, or into the hands of religious persons, to be instructed in Christianity. *Fleury*, H. E. viii. 367. ³ Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, vi. 14, § 2.

⁴ See the remarks of S. Basnage on this fable. (*Ann.* ii. 660.)

against the Jews, as they were enemies to the Gospel. He subjected to punishment those who should become proselytes to Judaism, and he ruled the Jews with a strict and heavy hand. He ordered churches to be built, where they were necessary, and where they were not, as in those towns and villages which were inhabited almost only by Jews, which must have been a great mortification to that people. He made a law, as an ancient author tells us, which condemned those, who should speak evil of Christ, to lose half their estate.

In his time, as Chrysostom relates, the Jews endeavoured, not by arms and violence, but in a silent and quiet way, to steal a settlement at Jerusalem, and to build themselves a temple, or some little edifice, which they would have called a temple: of which Constantine being apprised, he is said to have cut off the ears of those who had been the forwardest in this attempt, and to have ordered them to be sent to their several abodes with this mark of his displeasure. "Eutychius adds, that Constantine obliged them all to be baptized, and to eat pork at Easter. Persecution can hardly be carried further than this: but I doubt whether the facts be true. St. Chrysostom has great authority in the Church, yet it is not always safe to trust him as an historian; and indeed the Jews themselves say, and Abulpharagius confirms it, that it was the Emperor Adrian who cut off their ears, and sold them as slaves in the markets. Besides, Jerusalem was rebuilt in the reign of Constantine; its bishop had assisted at the Nicene council; and the emperor adorned it with such magnificent structures, that Eusebius told him, in a *profane manner*,⁵ that he had built the new Jerusalem foretold by the prophets. How then could the Jews mutiny and assemble there to do what was already done? Lastly, in the Theodosian code, although there be many laws, under the name of Constantine, against the Jews, there is not one which orders them to have their ears cut off, to be baptised, and to eat swine's flesh.

"But this prince published several edicts, which show the condition and the unquiet temper of the Jews in his time. The first is one of the most important. It was made, if I mistake

⁵ A man must be in a quarrelsome humour to treat Eusebius so roughly for such a trifle.

not, on account of Joseph, who had abandoned the synagogue, to embrace Christianity. The Jews vexed at his conversion, persecuted him even in his own house; and having found him reading the Gospel, they took the book from him, loaded him with insults and blows, and dragged him to the synagogue, where they scourged him cruelly. Not content with these outrages, they flung him into the river Cydnus, whose current carrying him out of their sight, they had the joy to think that he was drowned: but God preserved his life. He received baptism, and made himself known at court, and obtained leave from the emperor to build churches in divers places where there never had been any before. The Jews were then settled at Diocæsarea, Tiberias, Nazareth and Capernaum, and had so engrossed those cities that they would suffer no strangers there, not even the Samaritans. Joseph undertook to introduce Christianity into these cities, and began to build churches in them. At Tiberias he met with an opposition, which procured him the favour of a miraculous assistance. There was in that town a large edifice which had been intended for a temple to Adrian: as it had not been finished, there was a design to use it for a bagnio. Joseph was resolved to make it a church, and, wanting lime, he built some furnaces without the city for that purpose. The Jews, irritated at his attempt, had recourse, as Epiphanius relates it, to magic arts; and they were so successful that the fire could not be kindled, nor any lime be made. Joseph, vexed at such an unforeseen incident, went out from the city, followed by a great number of people, whose curiosity led them to see what he would do. When he came to the place, he made the sign of the cross, and invoking the name of Jesus over some water which he had brought in a large vessel, endued it with a power to dissipate the enchantment, and to kindle the fire: and flinging some of it into each of the furnaces, the wood instantly took fire, and the flames appeared. This miracle converted a great number of the Jews; but the rest remained hardened, and ceased not to oppose the building of the temple; so that only a part of it was finished, in which a small church was erected.

“Epiphanius” seems to have been thoroughly persuaded of

⁶ See the whole history of Joseph in Tillemont (H. E. vii. 290). It is a curious legend, and it rests upon the authority of Epiphanius.

the truth of this miracle. As for us, we shall only observe that the Jews were still powerful under Constantine, since they possessed four towns, one of which was Nazareth, where Christ had been brought up. Their numbers made them insolent, for they assaulted those who went over to Christianity, and publicly opposed the execution of the imperial orders for the building of churches.

“This was what obliged Constantine to publish the edict of which we have been speaking. He upbraids them, *that when any person had a mind to quit their religion, they stoned him or cast him in the fire*: and he condemns them and their accomplices to the same punishment. We see here the traces of those transports of zeal, by which they thought themselves authorised to kill those whom they surprised in any flagrant crime. These were pretended to be precepts of the oral law, and it was alleged that Phineas had executed the verbal orders of Moses. Another example also was produced from the Maccabees, when Mattathias slew the Jew who was performing Pagan rites. Their doctors authorised such practices, and Philo affirms that God had established them. The Essenes, devout and austere, ordered that if any one should blaspheme against Moses, he should be slain. This sect had not the power of life and death, and therefore must have punished such offenders by an act of zeal. In spite of the horrible disorders and massacres perpetrated by the zealots at Jerusalem, the nation still preserved the dangerous maxim; and the Mischna teaches that if any one renounces fundamentals, he must be slain: by which rule they stoned, burned, and flung into rivers those who apostatised, under the reign of Constantine; so that he was obliged to repress this violence, and, as they obeyed not his first law, he was forced to publish a second.

“He also forbade Christians to go over to Judaism, under penalties to be inflicted at the pleasure of the magistrate. What was most to be feared was, that slaves might be seduced by their masters: he therefore suffered not the Jews to circumcise their servants, and ordered all those to be set at liberty who had been so used, or who were willing to embrace Christianity. Eusebius says that it was not permitted to the Jews to purchase or to keep Christian slaves; and gives this reason for it, that it was not fit that they, who have been redeemed by the blood of Jesus

Christ, should be in bondage to the murderers of the prophets and of the Son of God.⁷

“Lastly, Constantine ordered that the Jews might be made *Decurions*, since it was reasonable that they should bear part of the burden of public offices: but he exempted the patriarchs, and priests, and those who had considerable employments in the synagogues, as men who had not leisure to serve in civil offices; and indeed it was not an honour but a burden to serve as a *Decurion*, and every one endeavoured to shun it by taking other employments in the army and in the state, or by obtaining an exemption from the emperor. Constantine and his sons granted them to so many persons, that in the time of Julian none were left to serve the public in those posts. He was therefore obliged to recall those privileges, without discrimination, which caused great clamours against him and his memory, whilst others commended his conduct. Such was the condition of the Jews under the first Christian prince.”⁸

Under Constantius, the violent dissensions amongst the Christians might have been profitable to the Jews, if they could have been quiet, and had behaved themselves well: for when the Christians had divided and subdivided themselves into sects, they hated, calumniated, and oppressed each other more than they did the infidels; and in ⁹the fourth and fifth centuries it

⁷ Theodosius forbad the Jews to keep Christian slaves (A.D. 384). *Cod. Th.* L. iii. *Tit.* i. p. 246.

⁸ Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, vi. 14.

⁹ Honorius and Theodosius II. made a law, that the Jews should not be compelled to violate their Sabbaths and their other holy days, upon any pretence (A.D. 409). *Die Sabbati, ac reliquis, sub tempore quo Judæi cultus sui reverentiam servant, neminem aut facere aliquid, aut ulla ex parte conveniri debere præcipimus: cum Fiscalibus commodis, et litigiis privatorum, constat reliquos dies posse sufficere.* (*Cod. Th.* L. ii. *Tit.* viii. p. 125.) Thus were the Jews indulged, whilst no pity and favour was shewed to those Christians who were called heretics.—Arcadius and Honorius, in their law, *de Judæorum foro* (A.D. 398), had ordered that in civil things the Jews should be subject to the civil laws, but in religious things to their own laws and decisions. (*Cod. Th.* L. ii. *Tit.* i. p. 87.)—Valentinian I. had also protected the Jews, and did not permit their synagogues to be profaned. (A.D. 368.) See *Cod. Th.* L. vii. *Tit.* viii. p. 344, et *Gothofred.* This illustrious Prince had his faults, but he had his virtues likewise. He was a true and a steady friend to toleration, and would not suffer his subjects to be persecuted for their religious opinions. He was also a friend to letters and to learned men. For these two good qualities he deserves to be mentioned with respect; and it is much to be wished that all princes would imitate his example.

was safer to be a Jew or a Pagan, than to be an heretic, or a schismatic, or a Christian of this or that denomination; and the obscurer the controverted points were, the greater was the contention, as it usually happens. But the Jews, who could never be at rest, took arms in Palestine, in the time of Constantius, and slew the soldiers who were quartered there, and many of the inhabitants, and ravaged the country: upon which Gallus Cæsar, the emperor's cousin, attacked them, and being of a cruel disposition, he burnt their cities, and slew all that he could find, without sparing even the women and the children.

Julian, in spite to the Christians, used the Jews kindly, and promised them great things, and had a mind to settle them again at Jerusalem, to rebuild their temple, and to enable them to observe their ceremonial as well as their moral law;—which would have been an insult upon Christ and Christianity. He was resolved, says Marcellinus, to spare no pains or expense, and to restore the temple to its former splendour; and he gave orders to the governor of the province to set about it; which was instantly done: but when the work was begun, terrible balls of fire broke out from the foundations, and made the place inaccessible, and upon many repeated endeavours slew the workmen; so that the fire never ceasing to rage whilst any attempt was made to go on with the work, the undertaking was laid aside.¹

The same thing is related by many Christian writers: as, by Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Philostorgius, and Theodoret; some of whom lived at the time. They say nothing that contradicts the Pagan historian; but they mention an earthquake, and add some circumstances not recorded by him, in which perhaps there may be exaggeration and embellishment. There is not one of these Christian authors who has not impaired his credit by the relation of miracles manifestly false; but still their testimony as

¹ Ambitiosum quondam apud Hierosolymam templum, quod post multa et interneciva certamina, obsidente Vespasiano posteaque Tito, ægre est expugnatum, instaurare sumtibus cogitabat immodicis: negotiumque maturandum Alypio dederat Antiochensi, qui olim Britannias curaverat pro præfectis. Cum itaque rei idem fortiter instaret Alypius, juvaretque provinciæ rector, metuendi globi flammæ, prope fundamenta crebris assultibus erumpentes, fecere locum, exustis aliquoties operantibus, inaccessum: hocque modo, elemento destinatius repellente, cessavit inceptum.—Ammian. Marc. xxxiii. 1.

to the principal fact is of weight, and is confirmed by Marcellinus, by Jewish writers, and perhaps by some passages in Julian's Epistles; and by this circumstance above all, that they appeal to a thing which any one might go and see with his own eyes, to the interrupted work at Jerusalem, and to the foundations of the temple which had been digged up by the Jews, to clear the ground for the intended edifice: so that, all things considered, the story is as well attested as one can reasonably expect.

But when a man has no mind to believe a thing, he seldom wants excuses. The Jews who lived at that time, and would not allow this to be a miracle in favour of Christianity, ascribed it perhaps to God's displeasure against Julian;—a bigotted idolater, who deserved not the honour of rebuilding his temple; or to their own transgressions, which made them unworthy of being at that time restored; for men will acknowledge their own faults, when they can reap any advantage from the concession. The Pagans might give the honour of it to their deities, who hated the Jewish superstition and impiety; they might say that Providence interposed, just as it did when the Cnidians endeavoured to make an island of their peninsula.² And perhaps both Jews and Pagans ascribed it to natural causes; for there have been eruptions of subterraneous fires in various times and places, and such eruptions have perhaps sometimes accompanied earthquakes, though not so often as some have imagined. Tacitus mentions a remarkable instance of fire issuing from the earth:—*Sed civitas Juhonum, socia nobis, malo improvise afflicta est: nam ignes terra editi, villas, arva, vicos passim corripiebant, ferebanturque in ipsa conditæ nuper Coloniae mœnia; neque extinguere poterant, non si imbres caderent, non si fluvialibus aquis, aut quo alio humore niterentur: donec inopia remedii, et ira cladis, agrestes quidam eminus saxa jacere, dein residentibus flammis propius suggesti, ictu fustium, aliisque verberibus, ut feras absterrebant: postremo tegmina corpori direpta injiciunt, quanto magis profana et usu polluta, tanto magis oppressura ignes.*³

² Herod. i. 174.

³ Tacit. Ann. xiii. 57. This relation given by Tacitus has been thought extravagant and romantic by a late writer. Let us consider whether it be not supported by an authentic account of a fountain in Poland:—"In Poloniæ minoris Palatinatu Cracoviensi mons reperitur, *Admirabilis* appellatus, in cujus plagæ meridionalis medio scaturigo quædam aquæ limpidissimæ cum strepitu ac vibratione notabili

We have an account of a tract of land about two miles long, near the Caspian Sea, which is inflammable, and which always burns without casting out either smoke or flames, or consuming anything.⁴ In the year 1647, at Santorini, an island in the Archipelago, subject to earthquakes, *silvæ subterraneo igne conflagrantes pastoribus et armentis non leve damnum intulerunt.* Ammianus Marcellinus, after describing the earthquake by which Nicomedia was overturned, adds, *Superesse potuit ædium sacrarum et privatarum, hominumque pars major, ni palantes abrupte flammarum ardores per quadraginta dies et noctes quicquid consumi poterat exussissent.*⁶ But these Nicomedian fires were the fires of kitchens, baths, forges, &c., which burnt the timber and other combustible materials of the fallen houses, as Sozomen expressly informs us.⁷

In the fifth century the city of Antioch was destroyed by an earthquake and a fire.⁸ This also seems to have been no subterraneous eruption, but like the fire at Nicomedia. Sixty-one

exsurgit, cujus quidem ebullitio seu turgescencia cum lunæ augmento intenditur, cum decremento remittit.—Nullo intra natales hiemis congelascit frigore, imo, quod mirabile, a face propius admota instar subtilissimi spiritus vini exardescit, ut flamma super aquæ superficiem instar bullarum agitetur et subsultet, ideoque fons hic *Ignis fatuus* audiat. Atque hic quidem ignis sponte sua nunquam extinguatur, nisi scopis percutiatur; quemadmodum ante annos circiter triginta quinque, cum accolæ accensum restinguere negligerent, per cataractas subterraneas sensim progrediendo radices arborum, et cum his totam vicinam silvam, in cineres redegit, per tres fere annos durans, antequam perfecte suffocari posset: a quo tempore publicæ etiam excubiæ constitutæ sunt, quæ frivolas ejusmodi accensiones impedian. Dum autem aliquantulum flagrat hæc aqua, multum sui impetus deponit, intra quatuordecim dies vix recuperandi. De cætero quamvis ligna admota brevi comburat hæc flamma, adeo tamen subtilis est, ut aquam non calefaciat, sed hausta hæc frigida percipiatur; imo nec ipsa extra suam scaturiginem exardescit, utut in vasis exactissime clausis asservetur. Inflammabilitatem hujus fontis cunctis superioribus seculis ignotam fulmen manifestavit, quod casu eum feriens eundem accendit. Hinc lignatores ex silva vicina accurrentes, virgultis ex cæsis arboribus aquæ summitatem verberando ignem restinxerunt, a quo tempore aliquoties postmodum, experimenti causa, mediante face ardente illa denuo accensa, et virgultorum succussione quoque extincta fuit. Unde factum ut provinciæ illius incolæ cæca credulitate sibi persuaserint, fulmen seu tonitru a prima illa accensione in profundo fontis remansisse, quod, dum egredi conetur, aquam adeo exagitet, ut flammam hanc ad ejus superficiem erumpere faciat.”—See *Act. Erud.* 1684, p. 326.

⁴ *Phil. Transact.* for the year 1748, No. 487, 488.

⁶ *Act. Erud.* 1688, p. 517.

⁶ *Amm. Marc.* xvii. 7.

⁷ *E. H.* iv. 16.

⁸ Succussio et terræ motus urbi supervenientes, pæne universam prostaverunt. Posthæc secutus est ignis:—quæcumque enim loca a succussione et terræ motu subversa non fuerant, ignis depascens in cinerem ac favillas redegit. *Evagrius*, iv. 5.

years after, there was another earthquake at Antioch, described by Evagrius who was then in the city, in which sixty thousand persons perished: but, by the mercy of God, says Evagrius, no fire broke out.⁹ When twelve cities in Asia fell by an earthquake, fire was seen to burst out.¹

Josephus mentions a violent earthquake in Judea.² There had probably been other earthquakes in Palestine, in divers times. That in the reign of Uzziah is mentioned as very remarkable by Zechariah³ and by Amos.⁴ But though it should be supposed and allowed that the eruption was not without natural causes, and that the seeds of it lay in the bowels of the earth; yet, as this most uncommon fire broke out at the very instant when the Jews and Pagans were attempting to rebuild the temple, and was renewed, as the historian says, upon their renewed attempt to go on, and ceased when they gave over, these circumstances seemed to be plain marks of a providential interposition.⁵ Another, and a most memorable circumstance, which distinguished it from the pretended miracles of those days, is, that it was not wrought to serve a party, and either to favour, or to confute, Athanasians,

⁹ Nullum exortum est incendium, quamvis ingens ignis copia passim in urbe esset, partim ex focis, partim ex publicis et privatis lucernis, ex culinis item et fornacibus ac balneis, aliisque innumeris locis. Evagr. vi. 8.

¹ Effulsisse inter ruinam ignes memorant. Tacit. Ann. ii. 47.

² Ant. xv. 5. 'Εν τούτῳ, καὶ τῆς ἐπ' Ἀκτίῳ μάχης συνεσταμένης Καίσαρι πρὸς Ἀντώνιον, σεισθεῖσα ἡ γῆ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὥς οὐκ ἄλλοτ' ἐδόκει, τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ κτηνῶν πολλὴν φθορὰν ἐποίησεν, ἐφθάρησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπὸ ταῖς πεπτωκυῖαις οἰκείαις περὶ μυρίους.

³ Zech. xiv. 5.

⁴ Amos i. 1.

⁵ For a more recent explanation of this phenomenon, which is supposed to have proceeded from frequent explosions of inflammable air generated in the extensive excavations by which a great part of the city of Jerusalem was undermined, see the life of *Julian* in the *Encycl. Metropolitana*. It was first suggested by Michaelis; and was of course adopted at once by Mr. Milman in his *History of the Jews*, and his notes on Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Without denying that the idea has much apparent plausibility, it may yet be questioned whether the circumstances of the case were not sufficiently important to call forth an especial manifestation of the divine power; and whether it is not more probable that God should interfere to uphold his religion against a daring and insolent attempt to destroy the prophetic evidence in its behalf, than that an accidental ignition of gaseous matter should have had the effect of disconcerting a plan, to which the emperor had attached such immense importance. At all events, the attempt of Julian was as vain as it was impious; and, however frustrated, the evidence of the complete failure of his design remains unanswered and unanswerable, to the everlasting triumph of the Gospel, and the utter confusion of infidelity.—EDIT.

Arians, Semiarians, Sabellians, Novatians, Manichæans, Monks, Anti-Monks, Relic-mongers, Relic-haters, Fasters, Eaters, Friends or Foes to matrimony, &c. No sect could claim any countenance or honour from it; but it was performed by Providence for the credit of Christianity, and to serve the common cause against Judaism and Paganism.

It has been said that Christ, who foretold the destruction of the Temple, yet has not affirmed that it should be rebuilt no more, or has not clearly declared how long it should lie in ruins; and that if the Jews had rebuilt their temple under Julian, yet they would not have had time to make use of it, because his Christian successor would have pulled it down, or converted it into a Church; and that therefore there was no occasion for a miracle to prevent Julian's design. But where is the force or the reasonableness of this argument? If it was not fit that the Jews should have a Temple, it might surely be as proper that God himself should interpose, as that he should leave it to the Christians; and it was more to the confusion of Judaism, and to the honour of Christianity, which certainly was concerned in the affair.

The Jews, according to the writers of the New Testament, suffered the evils, which they underwent, for their disobedience, and their rebellion against Christ; and as the national disobedience then continued, it was fit that the national punishment should continue also. The ceremonial Law had been abolished by the Gospel, and therefore it was fit that the Jews should not be put in a capacity to observe it, though they were ever so willing. Thus they were under a curse, as the ancient Christian writers often observe, because they could not perform the legal expiations and atonements. The Jews might have replied that God accepted the will for the deed; that a contrite heart would serve instead of sacrifices; that no man is bound to impossibilities; and that under the Babylonian captivity they ceased not to be God's people, though they had neither temple nor sacrifice. But the long cessation of the ceremonial law for no less than three hundred years brought in a prescription against it, and showed that it was antiquated; and that the New and Second Covenant had taken place of the first. The longer the Jewish dispersion and the desolation of Jerusalem continued, the more force the Christian argument gathered. In the time of Julian

it pressed hard upon them, but much harder when that nation had lost all distinction of tribes, and could find no Priests and Levites to officiate, though their Temple had been rebuilt. The argument now stands thus :—Your forefathers, when, by idolatry, sorcery, shedding of innocent blood, and all sorts of defilements, they had provoked God beyond measure, were carried captives to Babylon ; but after seventy years they returned and rebuilt their Temple. Since that time you have been no more guilty of idolatry ; and yet you are rejected of God these seventeen hundred years. What crime have you committed against him worse than idolatry, or high treason, for which you are thus severely punished beyond all former example of God's dealing with you ? It must be for the rejection of the Messiah. Orobius the Jew, in his dispute with Limborch, was greatly distressed by this argument, and knew not how to answer it.

The subject, which I am now treating, has been very well discussed by Mr. Warburton, to whose book I refer the reader for farther satisfaction ; and to his arguments and observations I shall only here add a few remarks, to confirm those of my friend.

First :—The fire which came out from the foundations of the Temple, and destroyed the workmen, and dispersed the Jews, was, to the Jews, a particular mark of God's displeasure and interposition ; because it was the way in which God had been constantly used to manifest himself. God, considered as the punisher of sinners, is said to be a *consuming fire* ; when he appeared, his glory was as a *devouring fire* ; when he is represented in the Psalms as taking vengeance, *fire* is said to have proceeded from him, and *smoke*, and *burning coals*, and *lightnings* ; *fire* is an emblem of his wrath and vindictive justice ; by *fire* he often punished the ungodly, as the inhabitants of Sodom, and the rebellious Jews ; by *fire* the world is to be consumed, and the future punishment of evil angels and evil men is represented under the words, *everlasting fire*. Hence in the Holy Scriptures, *fire heaped upon the head* denotes vengeance descending from above, that is, *divine vengeance* ; and as the natural effect of heaping fire upon a man's head is destruction, in the figurative sense it must mean *punishment*. So in the Psalms,⁶ *Let burning coals fall upon them*. So in Esdras,⁷ *Let not the sinner*

⁶ Ps. cxl. 10.

⁷ 2 Esdr. xvi. 53.

say he hath not sinned, for God shall heap coals of fire upon his head who saith before the Lord God and his glory, he hath not sinned. So Solomon in the Proverbs,⁸ *If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat ; if he be thirsty, give him water to drink ; for thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord shall reward thee:—*which words of Solomon, St. Paul has made use of in his Epistle to the Romans.⁹

When God expelled Adam from Paradise, he placed a *flaming sword, which turned every way*, to keep him out. When he made a covenant with Abraham, a *smoking furnace* and a *burning lamp* passed between the divided sacrifice. When he appeared to Moses, it was in a *flame of fire* out of the midst of the bush. He guided the Israelites by a *pillar of fire*. When he descended upon Mount Sinai, it was in a *fire*, a *devouring fire* and an *earthquake* ; and the face of Moses *shone* after he had seen the glory of God. When the tabernacle was erected, the glory of the Lord filled it, and appeared as a *fire by night*. When Aaron and his sons were consecrated, there came a *fire* from before the Lord, and consumed the burnt offering ; and when Nadab and Abihu made an offering in an illegal manner, there went out a *fire* from the Lord, and slew them. When the people murmured at Taberah, the *fire* of the Lord burnt among them and consumed them. When two hundred and fifty men, joining themselves to Korah, offered incense, there came out a *fire* from the Lord, and consumed them. The Angel of God consumed Gideon's sacrifice with *fire*. The Philistines in the days of Samuel were discomfited by *thunder and lightning* ; and by *thunder and lightning* God showed his approbation of Samuel, and his displeasure against the Israelites. When Solomon dedicated the temple, the *fire* fell from heaven and consumed the burnt-offering, and the glory of the Lord filled the house. Elijah brought down *fire from heaven* to consume his sacrifice ; and twice afterwards, to destroy two captains with their companies, who were sent to apprehend him. A *fire* went before God when he manifested himself to this great prophet, who was afterwards taken up into heaven in a *chariot of fire*.

⁸ Prov. xxv. 21, 22.

⁹ Rom. xii. 20. Where see Grotius and Whitby. See also Jerem. v. 14, and Rev. xi. 5, and Le Clerc, *Bibl Anc. et Mod.* i. p. 373.

It was reported amongst the Jews that Herod, a little before the birth of Christ, broke open the sepulchre of David, to plunder it, and that two of his guards were struck dead with a fire which burst out upon them. So says Josephus, who gives it as a common rumour.¹

When James and John wanted leave to punish the Samaritans for their rudeness, they asked Christ to permit them to call down *fire from heaven*: and when the Holy Ghost descended at Pentecost, it was in the appearance of *fire*.

Thus God used to show his presence by *fire*, either to declare his favour or his anger. When he was propitious, he consumed the sacrifice; and when he was offended, he consumed the sinner: and therefore the fiery eruption at Jerusalem, upon the attempt to rebuild the Temple, seemed to be a signal mark of divine displeasure. Unbelievers will reject all these examples, as fabulous; and their system, though unreasonable, is so far consistent with itself: but why should a man, who believes the Scriptures, think it inconceivable that there should have been a providential interposition in this affair?

I observe secondly, that if Julian had succeeded in his attempt to rebuild the Temple, and had lived some years longer, the Jews would have been enabled to restore the Temple-service and the ceremonial law. Three hundred years, which were elapsed from the destruction of Jerusalem, had not perhaps so far confounded all distinction of families as to deprive them of a priesthood: but now, if they had Judæa in their possession, and a temple there, they could not re-establish the ceremonial law; having lost long ago all genealogies and all distinction of tribes. Some of the best Jewish doctors own as much, when they say

¹ Ant. xvi. 7. ὡς ἐλέγεται. It might be as true as the story related by Evagrius. "*Barsanuph*, the monk, in the time of Justinian wrought innumerable miracles, and is firmly believed to be still living, shut up in his cell, although more than fifty years are passed since any man has seen him, or he has received any nourishment. *Eustochius*, Bishop of Jerusalem, would not believe this, and ordered the cell to be opened in which the man of God had shut himself up; whereupon a fire burst out, and slew almost all those who were present." H. E. iv. 33. [There is no difficulty in accounting for either of these incidents on the philosophical principle, by which it has been proposed to explain the phenomena, which so completely frustrated the mad attempt of Julian. Sepulchres, so long closed, would naturally have been filled with inflammable gas; and those, who entered with torches to explore their recesses, would in all probability be killed by the explosion.—EDIT.]

that part of the office of the Messiah shall be to sort their families, restore their genealogies, and set aside strangers; and that he shall purge and purify the sons of Levi, saying, this is a priest, and this is a Levite.²

The Jews, since the destruction of Jerusalem, have lived under Pagan, Christian, and Mahometan princes; and from time to time have been oppressed by them all, even when they did nothing to deserve it, but behaved themselves in the most obliging, quiet, and submissive manner. As they were almost everywhere upon a kind of connivance, and upon the foot of strangers and sojourners, and excluded from places of power, honour, and profit, and from many ways of getting their bread, they applied themselves to commerce, and to lend money upon interest, and several of them in former days grew both rich and infamous by extortions. I say not this to reproach them in particular; for Christians have done and do the same. But what they thus got, perhaps by disingenuous dealing and dishonest tricks, the princes often took away from them with the utmost iniquity and insolence; and so they were drudges and tools to arbitrary power, and sponges to be squeezed by merciless and avaricious tyrants. Thus, here in England, King John cast them into prison, not for any crime that he had to lay to their charge, but to make them deliver up their effects to him: there they were put to the torture, had their teeth pulled out, and were mangled and maimed, to redeem themselves from destruction.³

A thousand calumnies have been spread concerning them, as, that they were magicians, that they profaned the host, and that they crucified Christian children;⁴ and as many lying miracles were reported, to confirm those accusations; and then popular emotions and massacres always ensued. For one story

² See Chandler's *Def. of Christ.* p. 47.—Il est étonnant qu'on ose soutenir qu'on a conservé la distinction des Tribus et des familles. Maimonides a eu la bonne foi d'avouer qu'elles étaient tellement confondues depuis le tems de Sennachérib, qu'on ne pouvait plus les démêler. *Hinc familiæ inter nos confusæ sunt, ita ut dignosci nequeant inter se, nec e locis ipsarum cognosci.* (Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, T. iv. p. 1032.)

³ — Libertas pauperis hæc est :—

Pulsatus rogat, et pugnâ concisus adorât,

Ut liceat paucis cum dentibus inde reverti. *Juv. Sat.* iii. 298.

⁴ See Manasseh Ben Israel's *Vindiciæ Judæorum*, in the *Phoenix*, vol. ii. p. 391.

of this kind that was true, a multitude of false ones were related. Socrates⁵ tells us that in the fifth century, in the time of Honorius, some Jews in the neighbourhood of Antioch, who were drunk, took a Christian boy, tied him to a cross, derided and reviled him, and, growing frantic, gave him so many blows that he died. Upon which the governor of the province punished them severely.

Some time after this a Jew went to several bishops, pretending to embrace Christianity, and was baptised many times, and got money from the Christians. At last, he went with the same story to Paul the bishop of the Novatians, and desired baptism. The bishop told him that he must first prepare himself, and learn his Christian rudiments, and read, and pray, and fast, for several days, which went much against the man's stomach. So he begged the time might be shortened, pretending zeal and impatience. But when he came to the baptismal font, behold a miracle! the water suddenly vanished away. Upon a second trial, the same thing happened, though the pipes of the font were carefully stopped. Thus the bishop found him out to be an impostor, and one of the congregation remembered that he had seen him baptised by Atticus.⁶ If there be any truth in the story, it is probable that the bishop, who was no fool, and saw that the Jew was a knave, over-reached him, and secretly unstopped a hole to let the water out.

Ambrose, who was made bishop of Milan, A.D. 374, very injudiciously defends the burning of a Jewish Synagogue by a Christian bishop, and the unlawfulness of rebuilding it; and in his letter to Theodosius⁷ on this subject, *he heaps together thoughts and expressions, which are rather declamations than arguments*; as Du Pin⁸ observes very fairly, and hints his dislike of such doctrines, though he dared not to speak out, and *provoke the hornets*.

⁵ E. H. vii. 16.

⁶ Ibid. vii. 17.

⁷ Ambr. Epist. xl.

⁸ Vol. ii. p. 285.—“Theodosio nuncius affertur de incenso Valentinianorum templo, nec non de subruta ab Episcopo Judæorum Synagoga. Rem Ambrosius sic exequitur in sua ad Theodosium epistola: *Monachi, prohibentibus iter Valentinianis, quo Psalmos canentes ex consuetudine usuque veteri pergebant ad Maccabæorum martyrium, moti insolentiâ incenderunt fanum eorum. (De Synagoga vero) relatum est a Comite Orientis militarium partium, incensam esse Synagogam, idque autore factum Episcopo; jussisti vindicari in cæteros, Synagogam ab ipso ædificari Episcopo. Ignis fano Valentinianorum a Monachis subjicitur. Factum et Episcopi et Monachorum*

“St. Ambrose expressed the most violent indignation against the emperor upon this occasion. He sent him a letter which is still extant, and held in veneration, as a glorious memorial of his fervent zeal. There are bold men who think that they may say and do anything under the mask of godliness. The saint tells the prince that he could pray to God no longer for him, if he would not grant him his request. After such a haughty prelude, he asks him with what face he could order a bishop to rebuild the synagogue which he had burned, since the bishop must either be a prevaricator if he obeyed, or a martyr if he disobeyed him. He takes the fault upon himself, and says that he had ordered the deed; not that this was true, but by way of bravado, and to challenge the emperor to punish him if he dared.

improbaverat Theodosius, neque immerito, ut nostra fert sententia. Itaque tumultus autores pœnis subjecerat: hoc moleste tulit Ambrosius, qui aculeatâ Theodosium epistolâ pungit:—Quid mandas in absentes iudicium? Habes præsentem, habes confitentem reum. Proclamo quod ego Synagogam incenderim, certe quod illis mandaverim, ne esset locus, in quo Christus negaretur. Missa est hæc ad Principem epistola: quâ lectâ, cum nondum flecteretur, reversus Mediolanum Ambrosius, in concione adversus Theodosium invehitur, inducto Christo sic renitentem alloquente, Ego te triumphare sine labore feci, et tu de me inimicis donas triumphos. Impetravit tandem, ut, quæ mandaverat Imperator, revocarentur.

“Zelum quidem Ambrosio non invidemus, prudentiam tamen in eo facto desideramus, cum et Monachorum et Episcopi facinus iniquitate conditum fuerit. Quid publicam evertere tranquillitatem, quid de Magistratus autoritate delibare, quid pugnas movere, quid tumultus excitare, si hoc non fuit? Lex est Honorii sapientissima:—*Christianis demandamus, ut Judæis ac Paganis quiete degentibus, nihilque tentantibus turbulentum, non audeant manus inferre, religionis autoritate abusi. Nam si contra securos fuerint violenti, vel eorum bona diripuerint, non ea sola quæ abstulerint, sed, convicti, in duplum quæ rapuerint restituere compellentur.* Equidem si Valentinianorum fana, si Judæorum Synagogæ evertendæ erant, principis edictum requirebatur. Neque privatis licet ædificia sive Ethnicorum sive Judæorum publica subruere, quorum usus legibus et autoritate Imperatorum conceditur. Quod si Monachis Episcopisve id licitum est, liceat quoque Heterodoxorum bona diripere, et privatas domos incendere, in quibus et pietatem negant, et Christo conviciantur. Pace Ambrosii, factum, quod laudat, et vis fuit, et furtum, quo legitimis dominis bona sua eripiebantur, cum perturbatione ordinis omnis, cujus Deus autor est et constitutor. Quam Monachis et Episcopo impunitatem Ambrosius comparavit, ea maxima fuit illecebra furoris, ut Antistites Ascetæque omnes licenter flammis cingerent ecclesias Hæreticorum, templa Ethnicorum, synagogas Judæorum. *Puto dicturum Episcopum (verba sunt Ambrosii) quod ipse ignes sparserit, turbas compulerit, populos concluderit, ne amittat occasionem martyrii. O beatum mendacium! Beata hæc mendacia nescit pietas.* —

“Hic quidem Baronius lupum auribus tenet, qui laudibus Ambrosii zelum afficit, quem sane improbat Gregorius Magnus, dum contraria Ambrosio statuit.”—S. Basnage, *Ann.* iii. 114.

He tells him that he would have done the same at Milan, if God had not prevented him by burning the Jewish synagogue himself. He then represents the church of God in tears, the godly bound in chains and fetters, the servants of the Lord condemned to the mines, and the triumphant exultation of the impious Jews, as the sure consequences of the emperor's orders. This sophistry and these rhodomontades are so many tokens of gratitude which St. Ambrose was pleased to give to his royal master for having been his friend, his patron and protector; and with this pride and insolence he repays his favours. Theodosius however complied, as they say, and excused the incendiaries from making restitution."⁹

Yet this behaviour is what Tillemont, Ceillier, and many others of the church of Rome, extol and admire; which makes us also admire no less the wisdom and the judgment of some of our brethren, who send us to learn ecclesiastical history from such writers, without giving us a caution not to trust them too far. They might as well send us to learn morality from Escobar, divinity from Bellarmin, and English history from Father Sanders, or any father of that communion.

A.D. 406. A certain Jew had been confined many years to his bed with a palsy at Constantinople. Having tried in vain the aid of all the physicians, and received no benefit from the prayers of the Jews, he resolved to have recourse to the Christians, and to receive baptism. When this was told to Atticus the bishop, he instructed him in the faith, and then ordered him to be brought in his bed to the baptismal font. The Jew there professing his faith in Christ, was baptized, and as soon as he was taken out of the water, he found himself cured, and his disease returned no more. "Thus did our Saviour think fit to show forth his power, even in our days, by a miracle which converted many of the Pagans. But the Jews, though they require signs and wonders, yet have not been moved by these miracles to embrace the Gospel."¹

This is one of the most plausible miracles that are related of those days. There is nothing in it absurd and unreasonable,

⁹ Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, L. vi. 14, p. 1266. See also some good remarks of Bayle, and of Barbeyrac, *Morale des Pères*, and p. 325, p. 330, where he takes notice of Symeon Stylites.

¹ Socrates, vii. 4.

either in the fact, or the circumstances, or the tendency. Add to this, that Atticus, by whose ministry it is said to have been wrought, was a good prelate, an enemy to violence and persecution, and remarkable for charity and moderation, as Sozomen informs us. But when we consider the genius of the fifth century, and of the historians and writers of those times, it is impossible not to hesitate. It deserves also some consideration, whether the bathing and the force of imagination joined together, might not by a natural operation remove a paralytic disorder.

Symeon Stylites began to preach upon his pillar, A. D. 423.² In his days the Christians of Antioch, by an insolent act of violence, took away from the Jews their synagogues. The Emperor Theodosius Junior, when he first heard of it, following the dictates of equity, commanded the Christians to restore to the Jews what was their property. Upon this the *zealous* Symeon, after the example of Ambrose, wrote a reprimanding letter to the emperor, and obliged him to change his sentiments, and to patronise these illegal and unchristian proceedings.³ This gives an ugly blow on the head to Symeon's miracles; since it is hard to suppose that the divine Providence should commit preternatural powers to the hands of a monk, who was not only an enthusiast, but a patron of persecutors, rioters, robbers, house-breakers, and seditious subjects.

Symeon's pillar was enclosed, afterwards, in a portico; and an annual miracle was wrought there, of which Evagrius himself was an eye-witness. *Ad lævum igitur columnæ latus, ipse cum reliqua populi multitudine ibi collecta, saltantibus circa columnam rusticis, vidi in fenestra stellam immensæ magnitudinis, per totam fenestram discurrentem atque radiantem: neque id semel, aut iterum ac tertio, sed sæpius; eandemque crebro evanescentem, atque iterum subito apparentem. Quod quidem non nisi diebus festis, quibus sancti viri memoria quotannis recolitur, fieri solet. Sunt etiam qui dicant (nec fides deroganda est miraculo, tum ob auctoritatem eorum qui id affirmant, tum propter alia quæ nos*

² Of this fanatic, see under the date of his preaching.—EDIT.

³ Tam acriter eum objurgavit, ut Imperator, revocata jussione sua, cuncta in gratiam Christianorum fecerit, et Præfecto Prætorii, qui hæc ipsi suggesserat, potestatem abrogaverit. *Evagr. i. 13.*

*vidimus) se ipsam illius personam vidisse, huc atque illuc volitantem, promissa barba, et capite tiara obvoluto, sicuti consueverat.*⁴ This fire was an *ignis fatuus*, contrived by the monks, to deceive the devout assembly, and such dupes as Evagrius. What tricks would not these monks have played, if they had possessed the secret of *electricity*?

A Jewish boy having eaten some of the consecrated bread with his Christian school-fellows (A.D. 536), his father, who was a glass-maker, discovered it, and flung the poor child into his fiery furnace, and locked him in. After three days, the disconsolate mother found him there safe and sound. A fine lady, as the boy declared, clothed in a purple robe, had been with him in the furnace, and had cooled the flames, and given him meat and drink. This lady was the Virgin Mary, who, about the year 408, began to manifest herself and to work continual miracles. Tidings of these wonders came to the ears of Justinian, who ordered the mother and the boy to be baptized, and admitted amongst the ecclesiastics: but the father, obstinately refusing to receive Christianity, was, by command of the emperor, crucified in the suburbs of Constantinople, as the murderer of his own child. For this story we are indebted to *Evagrius*.⁵

The miracle of the Confessors, who in those days spake plainly, after their tongues were cut out by the persecuting Arians, is also attested by *Evagrius*.⁶ Other miracles of this kind are related in later history, and are equally improbable. In the *Chronicon Saxonicum*, which is a collection of things, some useful, and some of small moment, we are told that Pope Leo the third was deposed by the Romans, who cut out his tongue and pulled out his eyes (A. D. 797); and that he saw and talked after this as well as he did before.⁷

Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons (A. D. 829), had drawn upon himself the hatred of the Jews, who were numerous in that city, by baptising their slaves. "The Jews," says he, "buy Pagan slaves; those slaves learn our language, and often take a liking to our religion, and address themselves to us and beg to be baptised. Can we refuse them? Or did the Apostles use to reject such converts? We desire not to rob the masters; we

⁴ Evagr. i. 14.

⁵ Ibid. iv. 36.

⁶ Ibid. iv. 14.

⁷ Compare this with *Fleury*, H. E. x. p. 22.

are willing to redeem their slaves, and to return them the full price which they paid for them." The Emperor Louis was persuaded to take part with the Jews in this affair; upon which Agobard wrote him a letter of remonstrances, which, upon the whole, seem not to be unreasonable. In this letter he charges the Jews with the crime of stealing Christian children, and selling them for slaves.⁸

It is observable that the Popes,⁹ in all times, have showed far more kindness and clemency to the Jews, than the Christian Princes. One reason was, that the Court of Rome has usually excelled all other courts in policy, craft, and worldly wisdom. It saw the folly of driving away and distressing the Jews; and it knew the use that was to be made of an industrious people, skilful in commerce, and in the management of revenues; who had no particular dislike to Papal authority, no disposition to assist heretics, schismatics, enemies of Popery, reformers, and separatists, and no credit to make proselytes to their own religion.

"The Council of Basil, held A. D. 1434, extending its pastoral care and its jurisdiction very widely, thought it proper not to overlook the Jews, who were numerous in that city, and in Germany. It ordered the Prelates, in all places where there were Jews, to appoint learned divines to preach to them. The sovereign Princes were obliged to send all the Jews in their dominions to attend at the sermon, and heavy penalties were to be inflicted on any person who should hide or detain them. At the same time it was forbidden to eat with them, or to keep them company. It was not lawful to have footmen, nurses, physicians, or farmers of that nation, or to let them houses near any church, or in the middle of any city: and that they might be the more easily known, they were obliged to wear a particular habit. Lastly, the Council passed a condemnation, and inflicted penalties on those who should pawn to them the sacred books, crosses, chalices, and the ornaments of Churches.

"The Council made regulations also relating to the Jews who should receive Christianity. These converts acquired by baptism

⁸ *Fleury*, H. E. x. 319, &c.

⁹ As Gregory, at the end of the sixth century; Alexander II. (A.D. 1068); Innocent III. (A.D. 1198); Gregory IX. (A.D. 1236); John XXII. (A.D. 1320); &c.

a right to enjoy their own possessions and goods, those excepted which they had gained by usury: for they were obliged to restore these extortions, if the persons wronged were living; and in case of death, as the Church was the mistress of these unlawful and confiscated gains, she made a present of them to the new converts. This regulation was of a singular kind: for the Church has no right to appropriate to herself the goods of particular persons, especially if they had acquired them before they entered into the Church, and in the days of their ignorance; nor can she exercise it to the prejudice of the children and the heirs of those to whom restitution was due. This also was an obstacle to the conversion of the Jews, by stripping them of their acquisitions.

“The Council also, by a law of its own, declared the converted Jews capable of all civil offices in the city where they were baptised; because, forsooth, *it is more noble to be born anew of the Holy Ghost, than to be born of the flesh*. Councils have no business to dispose of the charges and privileges of Corporations; and the reason here assigned is droll; namely, that regeneration gives men a right to temporal dignities.

“The Council, after all, could not be certain of the sincerity of these proselytes, and seems to have doubted of it: for it permitted not the new converts to receive and return mutual visits, or to dwell together, knowing by experience that they only helped to spoil one another, and that their faith was rather weakened than improved by such intercourse. It also forbade them to bury their dead according to the Jewish ritual, to observe the Sabbath, and other national ceremonies; a sufficient proof that these new Christians were not sincere.—It ordered the curates to seek out Christian wives for these Jews, and to get them advantageous matches: and as it granted great privileges to the proselytes, it denounced terrible punishments against dissemblers; ordering the Priests to watch them narrowly, to deliver them to the Inquisitors, and to make use of the secular arm, that they might be punished with the utmost rigour; declaring that they who should protect these pretended converts should be treated as friends to heretics; and, carrying its authority still farther, it annulled and annihilated all privileges formerly granted to the Jews, either by Popes, or by

Emperors. One is amazed to hear Ecclesiastics talk at this rate, confounding things temporal with spiritual, political with ecclesiastical, and drawing false consequences from the one to the other. With reason the Council ordered that there should be care taken to instruct the Jews, and that they should be relieved by the alms of Christians; but by mere usurpation it claimed a power over emperors and imperial laws.”¹

In the year 1650, the Jews, as it is said, held an assembly in the plain of *Ageda* in Hungary, to examine the Scriptures concerning Christ. Many of them seemed disposed to own him for the promised Messiah; but upon hearing the doctrines of Christianity, as they were represented by some Priests of the Church of Rome who were present at the assembly, they were shocked at such idolatrous tenets, and cried out *Blasphemy*, and chose rather to reject the Gospel than to admit such a sort of Christianity. The Narrative of these remarkable proceedings was drawn up by *Samuel Bret*, who was present at that Synod.² The question is, whether this *Narrative* have any more truth in it than *the Adventures of Telemachus*.³

The account of the Jews who have been plundered, sent naked into banishment, starved, tortured, left to perish in prisons, hanged and burnt by Christians, would fill many volumes. But now they enjoy better times; they escape persecution even in some Popish countries; and those of them who dwell in Protestant nations have been well used, and nowhere more kindly than here; so that they have great reason to remember the command which God gave them by Jeremiah, when they were in Babylon, and to apply it to their present situation:—*Seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried, and pray unto the Lord for it; for in the peace thereof shall ye have*

¹ Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, T. v. p. 2051. ² It is published in the *Phoenix*, vol. i.

³ The authors of the *Acta Eruditorum* declared their just suspicions concerning it.—“Ceterum sunt in ea relatione nonnulla, quæ si plane dubiam fidem ejus non reddant, rerum saltem Judaicarum ignorantia auctorem arguant. Doctissimo certe Basnagio, in erudito de Historia Judæorum opere, plane illud Concilium prætermissum observamus.” 1709, p. 104. “Many things have been reported of us, that never entered into the thoughts of our nation; as I have seen a fabulous narrative of the proceedings of a great council of the Jews, assembled in the plain of Ageda in Hungary, to determine whether the Messiah were come or no.” Manasseh Ben Israel, in his *Defence of the Jews*, in the *Phoenix*, vol. ii. p. 401.

*peace*⁴. Why should we not, in charity, suppose them to be thus inclined? They are *men*; and men will commonly love those who treat them gently, and will certainly entertain a bad opinion of their persecutors. In this let us judge of others, by what we feel ourselves; since there are two things which every honest person equally dislikes, *to oppress*, and *to be oppressed*.

If we had a circumstantial and an impartial account of all the insurrections and rebellions of the Jews, and of the causes which produced them, we should perhaps find this people to have been often provoked and exasperated by ill usage; and, therefore, rather less turbulent and seditious than they have been commonly represented. We should not forget that it is oppression which, usually speaking, begets rebellion;—*oppression*, which, as the *wise man* observes, *will make a wise man mad*⁵.

St. Paul, in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, observes that God had rejected the Jews, and chosen the Gentiles to be his people; but, says he, this rejection of the Jews, as it is not universal, so neither is it final and irreversible. Some of them are now called to the faith, but to the greater part blindness is happened; and this blindness must continue, till the fulness, the more complete conversion of the Gentiles, be come; and then the people of Israel shall also be saved, that is, shall be converted to the Gospel, and so be put in a state of salvation. St. Paul argues thus:—If God has called the Gentiles to his grace after a long idolatry and infidelity; though they were never before admitted to those privileges which the Jews enjoyed; and though God had never promised to be their God for ever: much more will he recall his chosen people from their infidelity. Here we have his own authority for it, which he also strengthens by appealing to the Scriptures: *It is written*, says he, *The Deliverer shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob; and God shall make a covenant with his people, and take away their sins*.⁶ The Jews were called God's own people, and his first-born; to them Christ was sent; to them the Apostles first preached the Gospel; and the first Christian Church was that of Jerusalem, which in the primitive times was as the mother-church, and had some degree of dignity and pre-eminence over

⁴ Jer. xxix. 7.⁵ Eccles. vii. 7.⁶ Rom. xi. 26.

all churches. The Prophets speak of a future calling of the Jews, and of a state of stability, piety, power, happiness, glory, peace, and prosperity, which they should enjoy. The expressions which are used upon this occasion are extremely strong and magnificent, and have not as yet been literally accomplished. St. John also in the Revelation, when he describes the New Jerusalem and the glorious state of the Church, adopts the same ideas, and uses the same expressions; and therefore may be supposed to have had the same event in view: and the ancient Christians, either by tradition, or by examining the Scriptures, were generally agreed in holding that the Jews should in those last days become God's people again; and in the expectation of happier times the Jews also agreed with them.

The question here is, whether St. Paul's declaration was fulfilled in the conversion of several Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, and during the four first centuries; or whether he had a view to a still future and a much more extensive conversion. Upon this question commentators are divided; but the preservation of this people under so long, so signal, and so unexampled persecutions and calamities, would incline one to think that they are reserved for some illustrious purpose of Providence: and the expressions of St. Paul most naturally promise a conversion which is yet to come. Whitby has treated of the calling of the Jews, in his commentary on the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and in an Appendix, where the reader will find the substance of all that can be said on this side of the question. I know of no satisfactory answer that ever was made to it.

The utmost that can be collected from the passages of Scripture concerning this great event, is, that the Gospel shall, before the consummation of all things, flourish more, and extend itself farther, than at present; that Christianity shall be reformed, and reduced to its primitive and genuine purity and simplicity, and have a happier effect upon the manners of its professors; and that many, at least of the Jews and Gentiles, shall flow into the church. But to descend to particulars is to indulge the most uncertain conjectures. Predictions in general, before their accomplishment, are never perfectly understood; and the metaphorical and figurative style of prophecy adds to the diffi-

culty, and has often misled the unwary interpreter. The expounding such sort of expressions on this occasion too literally, has produced strange and precarious notions amongst ancient and modern Christians concerning the *Millennium*. Thus it has been supposed that Christ shall come and reign personally upon earth a thousand years; that the old Christian martyrs shall rise again to reign with him; that the Jews shall have a temple rebuilt, and a temple-service renewed; and that the righteous shall in those days enjoy the utmost temporal felicity:—all which seems to agree neither with the abolishment of the ceremonial law, nor with the pure and spiritual nature of the Gospel, nor with the promises of a true happiness which is to be expected, not here below, but in the kingdom of heaven.

The conversion and the restoration of the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles, if ever it be accomplished, must in all probability be performed by the visible manifestation of God's power and spirit, and not by ordinary and human means. This will appear, if we consider the present situation of the Jews, and of the unbelieving nations, and the impediments to their conversion, both from their own state and from the state of Christianity.

When the Gospel was first preached, its progress was swift and extensive. If you ask why it was so, and how it came to pass, the reason is, that it was accompanied with a plentiful effusion of divine and preternatural gifts, with prophetic and miraculous powers: else it could never have prevailed; and even the prejudices of education would have kept it out from all lands. Christianity at present is destitute of these aids, and is to be proved by no other ways than by inferences and deductions, and moral and historical proofs; which not only require learning and the exercise of reason in the teacher, but also a tolerable capacity in the persons to be taught. Now those men in general, who make up the bulk of society, are incompetent judges of complicated moral evidence, and of probabilities; which makes it extremely difficult to introduce Christianity anywhere by mere argumentative methods, and by convincing the understanding.

The Mohammedans and Pagans are for the most part poor reasoners, and take up implicitly the religious opinions which

they find established. Good sense and intellectual abilities are indeed natives of all climes, but they are not equally cultivated everywhere ; and nowhere less than in those countries of which we are speaking, where the vulgar are often only a better sort of brutes, and a little above the monkeys. Man is in a great measure what education and instruction make him. Despotic government, which is an enemy to the free exercise of the understanding, and the danger of examining points of faith, increases the stupidity and ignorance in such places. Where the will of one insolent man is the only law, there is usually neither learning, nor courage, nor virtue, nor religion. The manners also and the customs of those nations are in some things directly contrary to the spirit of the gospel. The gospel restrains polygamy and divorce, enjoins chastity and humanity, orders servants or slaves to be kindly used, and the female sex to frequent the public worship of God ; and therefore must be odious to those nations where different practices prevail. Hence it may be observed, that when Christianity, not long after the death of the Apostles, made its way in some parts of the eastern world, it probably had the assistance of miracles ; not only because of the hardships and persecutions which its professors then underwent, but because it contradicted the manners and customs of those who embraced it, and opposed itself to those indulgencies and practices which men are never willing to give up, and which are to them a kind of second nature. This, joined to some testimonies in ecclesiastical history, is no bad argument to show that miracles might continue somewhat longer than the Apostolical age, and be performed upon some important occasions ; particularly in preaching and establishing the Gospel amongst infidels.

There is little reason to hope that Pagan and Mohammedan nations should be converted at present by the Christians. They are not at all disposed to receive the Gospel, and to judge of the force of moral arguments and of strong probabilities. It would be a hard matter to convince them of the antiquity and the authority of our sacred books ; not because our proofs are weak and defective, but because they are not acquainted with our chronology and history. Yet these impediments and difficulties are not such as should discourage the attempts made by our

teachers and missionaries amongst the Pagans, in those countries where we have commerce and settlements. Such attempts are highly useful and commendable, and deserve public encouragement; and surely it is the duty of Christians, when they have means and opportunities, to relieve the spiritual, no less than the corporeal, wants of their fellow-creatures.

The Jews are dispersed over the earth, and dwell in Mohammedan, in Pagan, and in Christian countries: so that, though by descent they are Jews, by birth they are Persians, Turks, Italians, etc., and partake in some measure of the genius and temper of the nations in which they are born and educated. By dwelling amongst Pagans and Mohammedans, and under tyrannical government, they learn to reason as little as their masters and their neighbours, and to go on implicitly in the faith of their forefathers. Their neighbours never dispute much about religion; and it is controversy and free debate that opens and enlarges the mind, and improves the understanding; without this there is a dull stagnation of the intellectual faculties. Besides this, the Jews were never remarkable for accurate and methodical reasoning; and their traditionary doctrines and mystical interpretations help to spoil their judgment.⁷

The Jews, in countries where Christianity is not established, lie out of the way of receiving instruction, if they were willing to hearken to it. Who should teach them? The Christians, who dwell in those parts, are poor, ignorant, superstitious, slavish men, and sometimes dishonest men also, and not qualified for preachers of the Gospel: so that the conversion of the Jews cannot in all appearance begin in those regions. The Jews dispersed in Christian countries dwell either in Popish or in Protestant nations. There is not the least probability that the Papists should ever convert them. The violence which a man must offer to his own senses and reason, and the slavish deference that he must pay to human authority, before he can enter into that communion; the divine honours given to

⁷ "R. Falk began (A.D. 1530) to exercise his scholars in dispute, after the manner of the Christians: but this method did not please the wise, and was not generally approved. The Jews, who have a theology altogether mystical, and depending more upon the imagination than upon reasoning, have no taste for arguments and syllogisms." Basnage, *Hist. des Juifs*, L. vii. c. 30, p. 2072.

the Virgin Mary ; the worship of angels, saints, crosses, wafers, coffins, bones, rags, old iron, relics, pictures and images, supported by ridiculous miracles and traditionary lies ; the tyranny of the church, and the cruelty of the Inquisition ; these are insuperable obstructions to the conversion of the Jews, and excite in them prejudices against Christianity that are too strong and too plausible to be easily removed. The Jews abhor idolatry, and everything that borders upon it ; and in popish countries they have no notion of any other Christianity than what is there professed, and what they see before their eyes. The Jews, who dwell in Protestant countries, have not the same causes to dislike Christianity, which appears with more simplicity, which offers itself fairly to examination, which is purged from superstitious practices, and which forces itself upon no one with imperious insolence. But even in the reformed nations, too many obstacles remain to prevent and discourage the conversion of that people ; such as arise from the little influence which the gospel is observed to have upon the lives and manners of many of its professors ; from the disunion of Christians, and their division and subdivision into various sects, which usually entertain no favourable opinion of each other.

If I should embrace Christianity, a Jew might say, I have just begun the laborious inquiry : it remains to consider to whom I should join myself, and here I am quite perplexed with your divisions. If I should go over to the church of Rome, the Protestants will condemn my judgment, and say that I have made a miserable choice ; if I become a Protestant, the Papists will tell me I might as well have remained a Jew ; schismatics and heretics are in their opinion in as bad a situation, and as much excluded from salvation as Jews, Mohammedans, deists, sceptics, and atheists ; if I am a Protestant of this or that denomination, other sects of Protestants will blame me, and think me still in a dangerous condition, and perhaps call me a schismatic. Thus some Jews have reasoned ; and, that we may not be thought to have furnished them with objections which we cannot answer, let us offer a short reply. It might then be said to the Jew, *Search the Scriptures*, and examine our arguments, and if they convince you, receive the Gospel, and believe in Christ. You are then his subject and his servant ; for it is

not your belonging to this or that church, that makes you a Christian, but your belief that Jesus is the Son of God, and the Messiah. The rest you may do at your leisure, and it is not so laborious a task as you suspect. Only consider what the church of Rome, and what the Protestant churches require of you ; and judge which is the most reasonable, and the most conformable to the New Testament. The church of England, in her form of *Baptism of those of riper years*, requires of you only an assent to the Christian religion in general, and to the Apostles' creed in particular.

Another impediment to the conversion of the Jews is, that in the Christian world there is much indifference and coldness towards religion, much dissoluteness of manners and dishonesty ; that amongst us many sceptics, deists, and infidels are also to be found, who have deserted the faith in which they were educated. We may suppose, without any breach of charity, that in these respects the Jews are not better than the Christians, nor free from the same faults ; that they have their doubters, and their unbelievers, besides those who mind nothing except the cares and concerns and vanities and diversions of this world ; that they and we go, *one to his farm, and another to his merchandise*, whilst the prophets are little regarded by the Jew, and the apostles by the Christian.

Another great and well known difficulty in the conversion of the Jews, as also of the Mohammedans, is the doctrine of the *Holy Trinity* ; which they have always been taught to look upon as not reconcileable with the *unity of God*. All that I shall say to this, is, that no one should attempt to remove this prejudice, and to satisfy them upon this subject, till he has brought them to believe the divine mission of Jesus Christ, and his character as prophet, Messiah, teacher of truth, and worker of miracles. If they will not admit the things relating to his offices and ministry, it would be a vain and useless undertaking to debate with them about the dignity of his nature. And when it is necessary to proceed to that part of Christianity, this doctrine should be represented even as it is delivered in the New Testament, and no otherwise : and then many things may be observed concerning the *Λόγος*, the *Angel of God's Presence*, and the *Angel of the Covenant*, from the Old Testament, and from Philo-

and from some ancient Jewish writers. It will also be well worth while to consider how the oldest Christian apologist now extant hath reasoned with the Jews upon this subject; as also how Limborch managed that part of the controversy with Orobios. What right has a modern Controvertist to require more from a Jew than Justin Martyr required from Trypho? I might say, than the apostles and first preachers required from those whom they converted, when they admitted them to baptism? *And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest (be baptised). And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.⁸—And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.⁹*

⁸ Acts viii. 37.

⁹ John xvii. 3.—“Hic autem ita me gessi, ut nullius peculiaris inter Christianos controversi dogmatis, sed solius Evangelii patrocinium susceperim: secutus judicium viri summi et Religionis Christianæ patroni ac vindicis omnium calculo prudentissimi ac strenuissimi, Hugonis Grotii, qui in aureo suo et nunquam satis laudato *De veritate Religionis Christianæ* tractatu, non tantum eandem disputandi rationem observavit, sed et in epistola quadam ad Gerardum Joannem Vossium hanc instituti sui rationem reddit:—*Triados probationem in eo libro directe aggressus non sum, memor ejus quod a viro magno socero tuo audiveram, peccasse Plessæum et alios, quod rationibus a natura petitis, et Platonice, sæpe non appositis, testimoniis, adstruere voluissent rem non ponendam in illa cum Atheis, Paganis, Judæis, Mahumethistis disputatione, qui omnes ad sacras Literas ducendi sunt, ut inde talia hauriant, quæ nisi Deo semet patefaciente cognosci nequeunt.* Hinc quotiescunque Judæus ad dogmata quibusdam Christianis peculiaribus, qualia plura in ipsius scripto occurrunt, me pertrahere conatus est, ego studiose id declinavi; ratus, contra hominem Novi Testamenti auctoritatem negantem frustra disputari de dogmatibus alibi aut non, aut saltem non clare revelatis, quorum proinde fides divinam Novi Testamenti auctoritatem præsupponit: ac proinde sufficere, ut contra Judæum sola Evangelii divinitas adstruatur, de qua si quis argumentorum pondere convictus sit, eadem opera omnium quæ Evangelium tradit dogmatum veritas ac divinitas ipsi comprobata erit: quæ semel comprobata, ipse porro attenta adhibita Novi Testamenti lectione, omnibusque in timore Domini legitime examinatis, dijudicare poterit, quid de dogmatibus inter Christianos controversis consentaneæ veritati in Novo Testamento traditæ statuendum sit.” (*Limborch Præfat.*) “Tandem concludit vir doctus, quod *Propheta, qui in seipsum ut verum Deum Israelis fidem exegerit, qui Dei omnipotentiam sibi arrogaverit, qui verba sua, ut a se præcepta, populo indixerit, admitti non debet; et dato impossibili, quod Messias, quem Judæi expectant, eam doctrinam Israellem edoceret, jure foret ut pseudopropheta lapidandus.* Sed ego jam isti illationi occurri, quod Jesus Christus semper se Patris legatum et filium prædicet, et in se, ut talem, fidem exigit. Neque ulterius quicquam, ut necessario credendum, Evangelium exigit. Si qui plura ad salutem creditu necessaria decrevere, eorum decretis non teneor, qui solam Scripturam sacram unicam fidei meæ regulam agnosco. Ex illa itaque vir doctissimus, ut aliquoties monui,

MR. TEGG HAS JUST ISSUED THE FOLLOWING NEW PUBLICATIONS,

OF SUPERIOR CHARACTER, GENERAL UTILITY, AND POPULAR INTEREST, ON THE MOST INTERESTING SUBJECTS OF LITERATURE AND SCIENCE.

*** Orders from Merchants, for Exportation, of whatever magnitude, executed with Correctness and Despatch.*

BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND INTERPRETATION.

	£	s.	d.
BARNES'S NEW TRANSLATION OF ISAIAH. One large Volume. 8vo.	0	15	0
BROWN'S SELF-INTERPRETING BIBLE. 4to. Maps, &c.	1	10	0
———— DICTIONARY OF THE HOLY BIBLE. 8vo.	0	9	0
———— CONCORDANCE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. 24mo.	0	2	0
BURDER'S ORIENTAL CUSTOMS. New Edition. By GROSER. 8vo.	0	9	0
CAMPBELL'S NOTES ON THE GOSPELS. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	16	0
CALVIN'S COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS. 3 vols. 8vo.	1	10	0
CARPENTER'S BIBLICAL COMPANION. Imperial 8vo.	0	12	0
CHALMERS'S (Dr.) LECTURES ON THE ROMANS. 4 vols. 8vo.	2	2	0
CLARKE'S (DR. ADAM) COMMENTARY ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. 6 vols. Imperial 8vo.	6	8	0
———— SUCCESSION OF SACRED LITERATURE. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	15	0
DODDRIDGE'S FAMILY EXPOSITOR. Imperial 8vo.	1	1	0
ELSLEY'S ANNOTATIONS ON THE GOSPEL AND ACTS. By WALKER. 8vo.	0	12	0
FLEURY'S MANNERS OF THE ANCIENT ISRAELITES. By A. CLARKE. 12mo.	0	6	0
GRAY AND PERCY'S KEY TO THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. 8vo.	0	8	0
HENRY'S COMMENTARY ON THE SCRIPTURES. By BLOMFIELD. 4to.	1	10	0
HORNE'S (Bp.) COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS. 8vo.	0	8	0
JENNINGS'S JEWISH ANTIQUITIES. 8vo.	0	7	0
JONES'S BIBLICAL CYCLOPÆDIA. 8vo.	0	16	0
LELAND'S DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. 8vo.	0	7	0
LOCKE AND DODD'S COMMON-PLACE BOOK TO THE BIBLE. 8vo.	0	9	0
LOWTH'S (Bp.) LITERAL TRANSLATION OF ISAIAH. 8vo.	0	7	0
———— LECTURES ON HEBREW POETRY. 8vo.	0	8	0
LUTHER ON THE GALATIANS. 8vo.	0	10	6
NEWTON'S (Bp.) DISSERTATION ON THE PROPHECIES. 8vo.	0	8	0
OWEN'S EXPOSITION OF THE HEBREWS. 4 vols. 8vo.	2	16	0
———— EXERCITATIONS PREFIXED TO THE HEBREWS. 8vo.	0	14	0
PATRICK, LOWTH, WHITBY, AND LOWMAN'S COMMENTARY ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. 4 vols. Imperial 8vo.	4	10	0
PRIDEAUX ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. By Dr. M'CANE. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	18	0
SCOTT'S COMMENTARY ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. 3 vols. 4to.	4	0	0
STACKHOUSE'S HISTORY OF THE BIBLE, New Edit. By D. DEWAR, D.D. Imp. 8vo.	1	10	0
STUART'S COMMENTARY ON THE ROMANS. 8vo.	0	9	0
TROLLOPE'S NEW TESTAMENT IN GREEK, AND ENGLISH NOTES. 8vo.	1	1	0
WHITBY AND LOWMAN'S COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. Impl.	1	5	0
WILLIS'S GEOGRAPHY OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. 8vo.	0	12	0

LIGHT READING & BOOKS IN THE PICKWICK STYLE.

ADVENTURES OF CAPTAIN BOLIO. 32 Engravings. 12mo.	0	9	0
———— PAUL PERIWINKLE, OR THE PRESS-GANG. 40 Cuts.	1	1	0
———— GRACE DARLING. A Tale. 20 Engravings. 8vo.	0	5	0
ARABIAN NIGHTS, 3 vols. 32mo.	0	12	0
CHRONICLES OF CRIME, by CAMDEN PELHAM, Esq. Plates by PHIZ. 2 vols. 8vo.	1	8	0
COLMAN'S BROAD GRINS, with Cuts, Cloth, Gilt Edges	0	1	6
COMIC ARITHMETIC. By MARTIN. 40 Cuts. 8vo.	0	7	0
DOINGS IN LONDON. 30 Engravings. 10th Edit. 8vo.	0	8	0
EGAN'S PILGRIMS OF THE THAMES. 26 Plates. 8vo.	0	8	0
———— BOOK OF SPORTS AND MIRROR OF LIFE. Cuts, 8vo.	0	7	0
GIDEON GILES THE ROPER. By MILLER. Plates. 8vo.	0	13	0
GODFREY MALVERN. By MILLER. Plates. 8vo.	0	14	0
GRANT'S SKETCHES IN LONDON. 24 Engravings by PHIZ. 8vo.	0	8	0
HONE'S STRUTT'S SPORTS OF THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND. 8vo.	0	10	6
———— EVERY-DAY BOOK AND TABLE BOOK. 3 vols. 8vo.	2	2	0
———— YEAR BOOK. New Edition. Cuts. 8vo.	0	14	0
MAXWELL'S FORTUNES OF HECTOR O'HALLORAN. 8vo.	0	9	0
MORNINGS AT BOW-STREET. Cuts by CRUIKSHANK. Fcap. 8vo.	0	5	0
ODDITIES OF LONDON LIFE. 77 Cuts. 2 vols. post 8vo.	1	1	0
PICKWICK ABROAD. By REYNOLDS; Plates by PHIZ, &c. 8vo.	0	14	0

PARTERRE OF HISTORICAL ROMANCE, ANECDOTE, &c.	4 vols. 8vo.	0 16 0
PUNCH AND JUDY, with 24 Plates, by CRUIKSHANK.	Post 8vo.	0 4 0
ROBERT MACAIRE. 18 Plates, by PHIZ.	Post 8vo.	0 10 6
SYNTAX'S (Dr.) TOUR IN SEARCH OF THE PICTURESQUE.	8vo.	0 12 0
TITMARSH'S COMIC TALES. 20 Plates.	2 vols. post 8vo.	1 1 0
WORLD (THE) OF LONDON. By JOHN FISHER MURRAY, Esq.	12mo.	0 5 0

GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND BIOGRAPHY.

ADDISON'S DAMASCUS & PALMYRA, 2 vols. 8vo. 14s.	GOLDSMITH'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND, (Chiswick,) 12mo. 6s.
ADVENTURES IN ALGIERS, 3 vols. 8vo. 15s. 6d.	GUTHRIE'S GEOGRAPHY IN MINIA- TURE. by DAVENPORT, 18mo. 7s.
BARROW'S PETER THE GREAT, 5s.	HISTORY OF THE JEWS, by MILMAN, 3 vols. 18mo. 15s.
BLUNT'S REFORMATION, 5s.	HOLLINGS' LIFE OF GUSTAVUS ADOL- PHUS. 18mo. 5s.
BROOKES'S GENERAL GAZETTEER, New Edition, by FINDLAY, 8vo. 12s.	IRVING'S LIFE AND VOYAGES OF CHRIS- TOPHER COLUMBUS, 18mo. 5s.
BROOKES'S GENERAL GAZETTEER IN MINIATURE, by FINDLAY, 18mo. 7s.	JOHNSON'S HIGHWAYMEN, &c. 8vo. 9s.
CAMPBELL'S LIVES OF BRITISH ADMIRALS, fcap. 8vo. 7s. 6d.	JOSEPHUS'S HISTORY OF THE WARS OF THE JEWS, 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 7s.
CAVE'S LIVES OF THE FATHERS, New Edition, by CARY, 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 4s.	JOSEPHUS'S HISTORY OF THE WARS. Complete in 1 vol. 7s. 6d.
CAVE'S LIVES OF THE APOSTLES, New Edition, by CARY, 8vo. 8s.	LANDER'S DISCOVERIES TO THE NIGER, 2 vols. 18mo. 10s.
CECIL'S LIFE OF NEWTON, 32mo. 2s.	LANGHORNE'S PLUTARCH, 8vo. 9s.
CONDER'S MODERN TRAVELLER; each Work sold separately, viz. :—	LIFE OF CICERO, by HOLLINGS, 18mo. 5s.
AMERICA, 2 vols. 10s.	LIFE OF RICHARD I., 18mo. 5s.
ARABIA, 5s.	LIFE OF MAHOMMED ALI, 18mo. 3s.
AFRICA, 3 vols. Maps & Plates, 15s.	LIFE OF MAHOMET, by REV. S. GREEN, 5s.
SIAM AND ASSAM, 5s.	LIFE OF BRUCE, by MAJOR HEAD, 18mo. 5s.
BRAZIL & BUENOS AYRES, 2 vols. 10s.	LIVES OF EMINENT PHYSICIANS, 18mo. 5s.
COLUMBIA, 5s.	M'CRIE'S LIFE OF KNOX, 12mo. 4s. 6d.
EGYPT, NUBIA, AND ABYSSINIA, 2 vols. 10s.	MEMOIRS OF THE LIFE OF DR. ADAM CLARKE, by One of the Family, 8vo. 7s. 6d.
GREECE, 2 vols. 10s.	MEMOIRS OF JOHN SHIPP, New Edit. 5s.
INDIA, 4 vols. 1l.	M'FARLANE'S LIVES AND EXPLOITS OF BANDITTI AND ROBBERS, 18mo. 5s.
ITALY, 3 vols. 18s.	NAPOLEON BUONAPARTE'S LIFE AND ADVENTURES, 2 vols. 18mo. 10s.
MEXICO AND GUATEMALA, 2 vols. 10s.	NAPOLEON BUONAPARTE, THE CAMP AND COURT OF, 18mo. 5s.
PALESTINE, 5s.	NEAL'S HISTORY OF THE PURITANS, by TOULMIN, 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 16s.
PERSIA AND CHINA, 2 vols. 10s.	PALGRAVE'S ANGLO-SAXONS, 18mo. 5s.
PERU AND CHILI, 5s.	PILKINGTON'S DICTIONARY OF PAINTERS. By ALLAN CUNNINGHAM. 8vo. 21s.
RUSSIA, 5s.	ROLLIN'S ANCIENT HISTORY, 6 vols. 8vo. Maps, 1l. 12s.
SPAIN & PORTUGAL, 2 vols. 10s.	SEGUR'S NARRATIVE OF NAPOLEON'S EXPEDITION IN RUSSIA, 2 vols. 18mo. 10s.
SYRIA & ASIA MINOR, 2 vols. 10s.	SKETCHES FROM THE HISTORY OF VENICE, Maps and Cuts, 2 vols. 18mo. 10s.
TURKEY, 5s.	SOUTHEY'S LIFE OF NELSON, Cuts, &c. 5s.
MODERN TRAVELLER, 33 vols. 9l.	TOUR THROUGH SOUTH HOLLAND AND UP THE RHINE, 18mo. 5s.
CUNNINGHAM'S (ALLAN) LIVES OF BRITISH PAINTERS, SCULPTORS, &c. 6 vols. 1l. 10s.	TYTLER'S LIVES OF SCOTTISH WOR- THIES, 3 vols. 18mo. 15s.
DAVENPORT'S LIFE OF ALI PACHA, VIZIER OF EPIRUS, 5s.	TYTLER'S UNIVERSAL HISTORY, 6 vols. 18mo. 1l. 10s.
DAVENPORT'S HISTORY OF THE BASTILE, 5s.	WATSON'S LIFE OF PHILIP II. 8vo. 9s.
DRUMMOND'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A. H. ROWAN, ESQ., 8vo. 7s. 6d.	WATSON'S LIFE OF PHILIP III. 8vo. 9s.
EDMONDS'S LIFE AND TIMES OF WASHINGTON, 2 vols. 10s.	WELLS'S GEOGRAPHY OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS, Maps, 12s.
EUSTACE'S CLASSICAL TOUR IN ITALY. Seventh Edition, 3 vols. 15s.	WILLIAMS'S LIFE AND ACTIONS OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT, 18mo. 5s.
FULLER'S CHURCH HISTORY OF BRI- TAIN, by NICHOLS, 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 7s.	WILSON'S MISSIONARY VOYAGE TO THE SOUTH SEAS, 2s.
FULLER'S WORTHIES OF ENGLAND, by NUTTALL, 3 vols. 8vo. 1l. 7s.	
FULLER'S HISTORY OF CAMBRIDGE, WALTHAM - ABBEY, AND INJURED INNOCENCE, by NICHOLS. 8vo. 14s.	
GIBBON'S DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, Imperial 8vo. 1l. 4s.	

NOVELS AND ROMANCES.

ADVENTURES OF CAPTAIN BONNEVILLE, by IRVING, 3 vols. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 CAVENDISH, OR THE PATRICIAN AT SEA, 12mo. 6s.
 CELEBS IN SEARCH OF A WIFE, by HANNAH MORE, 12mo. 5s.
 DE FOE'S LIFE AND ADVENTURES OF ROBINSON CRUSOE, 2 vols. (Oxford) 10s.
 DE FOE'S LIFE AND ADVENTURES OF CAPTAIN SINGLETON, 5s.
 DE FOE'S LIFE AND ADVENTURES OF COLONEL JACK, 5s.
 DE FOE'S MEMOIRS OF A CAVALIER, 5s.
 DE FOE'S FORTUNATE MISTRESS, OR LIFE OF ROXANA, 5s.
 DE FOE'S CARLTON'S MEMOIRS AND LIFE OF MOTHER ROSS, 5s.

FLYING DUTCHMAN, by the Author of "Cavendish," 3 vols. 12. 11s. 6d.
 COOPER'S LIONEL LINCOLN, 12mo. 3s.
 IRVING'S KNICKERBOCKER'S HISTORY OF NEW YORK, 5s.
 JACK TENCH, OR MIDSHIPMAN TURNED IDLER, 18 Plates, 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 LIFE AND TIMES OF DICK WHITTINGTON, 22 Plates, 8vo. 8s.
 PORTER'S (MISS) LAKE OF KILLARNEY, a Tale, 12mo. 4s. 6d.
 ROBERT MACAIRE IN ENGLAND, Plates by Phiz, 8vo. 10s. 6d.
 WORTLEY MONTAGUE, 3 vols. 12. 11s. 6d.
 TITMARSH'S COMIC TALES AND SKETCHES, 12 Plates. 2 vols. 21s.
 TREASURY OF WIT AND ANECDOTE, 32mo, 2s. 6d.

BOOKS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE.

ABBOTT'S ROLLA AT SCHOOL, Royal 18mo, cloth, 2s. 6d.
 ROLLA'S VACATION, Royal 18mo, cloth, 2s. 6d.
 AÆSOP'S FABLES (Whittingham), 32mo. 3s. 6d.
 AIKIN'S CALENDAR OF NATURE, 2s. 6d.
 BOY'S OWN BOOK, 19th Edit. square, 6s.
 BREAKFAST-TABLE SCIENCE, 2s. 6d.
 BREWSTER'S NATURAL MAGIC, 5s.
 BOY'S BOOK OF SCIENCE, 16mo, 7s. 6d.
 CHESTERFIELD'S ADVICE TO HIS SON ON MEN AND MANNERS, 18mo. 1s. 6d.
 CHILD'S (MRS.) STORIES FOR HOLIDAY EVENINGS, half-bound, 2s. 6d.
 CHILD'S (THE) OWN BOOK, 7th Edition, Cuts, square 16mo. 7s. 6d.
 CHILD'S (THE) BOTANY, square 16mo, 2s.
 COPLEY'S (ESTHER) EARLY FRIENDSHIP, a Tale, 2s. 6d.
 COPLEY'S POPLAR GROVE, 2s. 6d.
 EARLY IMPRESSIONS, by a Lady, 1s. 6d.
 EDGEWORTH'S EARLY LESSONS, 2 vols. 18mo. 5s.
 EDGEWORTH'S ROSAMOND, 2 vols. 18mo, cloth, 5s.
 ENDLESS AMUSEMENTS, 18mo, 2s.
 ENTERTAINMENT FOR THE NURSERY, 155 Cuts, 4s.
 FISHER'S YOUNG MAN'S COMPANION, 2s. 6d.
 GIRL'S OWN BOOK, by Mrs. CHILD, 144 Cuts, square, 4s. 6d.
 GRIFFIN'S BOOK OF TRADES, 4s. 6d.
 HISTORY OF SANDFORD AND MERTON, 12mo. 4s. 6d.
 HOME, by SEDGWICK, 2s.
 MARY HOWITT'S JUVENILE BOOKS, 18mo. Sold separately at 2s. 6d.
 1. STRIVE AND THRIVE.
 2. HOPE ON HOPE EVER.
 3. SOWING AND REAPING.
 4. ALICE FRANKLIN.
 5. WHO SHALL BE GREATEST.
 6. WHICH IS THE WISER.
 7. LITTLE COIN MUCH CARE.
 8. WORK AND WAGES.
 9. NO SENSE LIKE COMMON SENSE.
 10. LOVE AND MONEY.

MARY HOWITT'S WORKS—CONTINUED.
 11. MY UNCLE, THE CLOCK-MAKER.
 12. THE TWO APPRENTICES.
 13. MY OWN STORY.
 JANEWAY'S TOKEN FOR CHILDREN, 32mo. 6d.
 JUVENILE SCRAP-BOOK, TALES, &c. 4s.
 JUVENILE EVERY-DAY BOOK, 4s.
 LOOKING-GLASS FOR THE MIND, 2s. 6d.
 LOVE TOKEN FOR CHILDREN, by Miss SEDGWICK, 2s.
 MOTHER'S STORY BOOK, by Mrs. CHILD, 18mo. 3s. 6d.
 PETER PARLEY'S GRAMMAR OF GEOGRAPHY, 4s. 6d.
 PETER PARLEY'S LIVES OF FRANKLIN AND WASHINGTON, 4s. 6d.
 PETER PARLEY'S TALES ABOUT EUROPE, ASIA, AFRICA, AND AMERICA, 7s. 6d.
 The Sea and Pacific Ocean, 4s. 6d.
 The Sun, Moon, and Stars, 4s. 6d.
 England, Ireland, and Scotland, 7s. 6d.
 Ancient and Modern Greece, 4s. 6d.
 Christmas and its Festivals, 7s. 6d.
 Animals, Cuts, 7s. 6d.
 The United States of America, 4s. 6d.
 Rome and Modern Italy, 4s. 6d.
 Mythology of Greece and Rome, 4s. 6d.
 Plants, edited by Mrs. LOUDON, 7s. 6d.
 Universal History, 4s. 6d.
 PHILIPS'S CONVERSATIONS ABOUT THE WHALE FISHERY, 4s. 6d.
 PHILIPS'S CONVERSATIONS ABOUT the TOOLS and TRADES of ANIMALS, 4s. 6d.
 RICH POOR MAN AND POOR RICH MAN, by Miss SEDGWICK, 2s.
 STORIES ABOUT POLAND, 2s. 6d.
 TEGG'S PRESENT FOR AN APPRENTICE. New Edition, 4s. 6d.
 TOM TELESCOPE'S NEWTONIAN PHILOSOPHY. Cuts, 4s. 6d.
 VILLAGE AND THE VICARAGE, 2s. 6d.
 WATTS'S DIVINE SONGS, 6d.
 WATTS'S DIVINE SONGS; with Essay by SCOTT. 6d.
 WHITE'S NATURAL HISTORY OF SELBORNE, by Lady DOVER, 3s. 6d.
 WRIGHT'S OCEAN WORK, 18mo. 2s. 6d.
 YOUNG MAN'S AID TO KNOWLEDGE. 24mo. 2s. 6d.
 YOUNG LADIES' STORY-TELLER, by Miss LESLIE, 2s.

THEOLOGY AND ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

	£	s.	d.
ADAMS' PRIVATE THOUGHTS ON RELIGION. 18mo.	0	2	0
AMBROSE'S (?) LOOKING UNTO JESUS, AND HIS OTHER WORKS. 8vo.	0	8	0
ALLEINE'S ALARM TO UNCONVERTED SINNERS. 32mo.	0	2	0
BARROW'S (REV. I.) WHOLE WORKS. 3 vols. 8vo.	1	4	0
BAXTER'S SAINTS' EVERLASTING REST. 18mo.	0	3	0
———— WORKS. 4 vols. Imperial 8vo.	4	4	0
BEAN'S FAMILY WORSHIP. New Edition. 18mo.	0	1	6
BERKLEY'S (BISHOP) WORKS, NOTES TRANSLATED. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	16	0
BLAIR'S (DR. HUGH) SERMONS. 8vo.	0	8	0
BOLTON'S TREATISES ON COMFORTING AFFLICTED CONSCIENCES	0	2	6
BOOTH'S (REV. ABRAHAM) SELECT WORKS. 12mo.	0	4	6
BRIDGE'S (REV. WILLIAM) WORKS. Now first collected. 5 vols., 8vo.	1	17	6
BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. And Life by ADAM CLARKE	0	3	0
———— With Plates. 8vo.	0	12	0
———— HOLY WAR. New Edition. 18mo.	0	3	0
BURDER'S FIFTY-TWO VILLAGE SERMONS. 12mo.	0	3	0
———— RITES AND CEREMONIES OF RELIGION. 8vo.	0	12	0
BURNET'S EXPOSITION OF THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES. 8vo.	0	7	0
BUTLER'S (BISHOP) ANALOGY OF RELIGION. With Index. 12mo.	0	3	0
———— SERMONS. 12mo.	0	3	0
CALVIN'S INSTITUTES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. 2 vols.	1	7	0
———— (Selections from), by the Rev. SAMUEL DUNN. 12mo.	0	6	0
CAMPBELL'S LECTURES ON ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. 8vo.	0	8	0
———— DISSERTATION ON THE MIRACLES. 8vo.	0	7	0
———— (D.D.) WORKS NOW FIRST COLLECTED. 6 vols. 8vo.	2	2	0
———— PULPIT ELOQUENCE AND PASTORAL CARE. 8vo.	0	7	0
CAVE'S PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY. New Edition by CARY. 8vo.	0	8	0
CHILLINGWORTH'S RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS—A SAFE WAY TO SALVATION. 12mo.	0	7	0
CLARKE ON THE PROMISES OF SCRIPTURE. 32mo.	0	1	6
CLARKE'S (DR. ADAM) CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. By DUNN. 12mo.	0	6	6
———— LETTER TO A YOUNG PREACHER, AND TRAVELLER'S PRAYER	0	2	6
———— SERMONS. With great Additions. 4 vols.	1	4	0
COLES ON GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY. 12mo.	0	4	6
COOPER'S SERMONS ON THE LEADING DOCTRINES OF THE GOSPEL, PRACTICAL AND FAMILIAR	0	3	0
CUDWORTH'S INTELLECTUAL SYSTEM, WITH MOSHEIM'S NOTES TRANSLATED. 3 vols. 8vo.	2	2	0
DAVIES'S LECTURES ON PROPHECY. 12mo.	0	2	0
DODDRIDGE'S MISCELLANEOUS WORKS. Imperial 8vo.	1	1	0
———— RISE AND PROGRESS OF RELIGION IN THE SOUL	0	1	6
DUNN'S SELECTIONS FROM THE WORKS OF REV. J. HOWE	0	6	6
———— CALVIN	0	6	6
DWIGHT'S SYSTEM OF THEOLOGY. 5 vols. 8vo.	1	10	0
———— 5 vols. Pocket Edition	0	14	0
EDWARDS'S (REV. JONATHAN) THEOLOGICAL WORKS. 2 v. Imp. 8vo.	2	10	0
ELLIS'S KNOWLEDGE OF DIVINE THINGS FROM REVELATION	0	6	0
EVANS'S SKETCH OF ALL RELIGIONS. New Edition. 12mo.	0	5	0
FINNEY'S SERMONS ON IMPORTANT SUBJECTS. 12mo.	0	4	0
FISHER'S MARROW OF MODERN DIVINITY. 12mo.	0	5	0
FULLER'S (D.D.) DISCOURSES ON THE BOOK OF GENESIS. 12mo.	0	5	0
FULLER'S HOLY AND PROFANE LIFE. Portraits. 8vo.	0	10	6
GILL'S BODY OF PRACTICAL DIVINITY. 2 vols. 8vo.	1	1	0
———— CAUSE OF GOD AND TRUTH. 8vo.	0	12	0
GOODWIN'S CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. By DUNN. 12mo.	0	6	6
———— REDEMPTION REDEEMED. New Edition. 8vo.	0	12	0
GURNALL'S CHRISTIAN IN COMPLETE ARMOUR. By CAMPBELL. 8vo.	0	12	0
HALL'S CONTEMPLATIONS ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. 8vo.	0	9	0
———— (REV. ROBERT) SELECT THEOLOGICAL WORKS. 12mo.	0	3	6
HALYBURTON'S THEOLOGICAL WORKS. 8vo.	0	14	0
HANNAM'S PULPIT ASSISTANT. New Edition. 8vo.	0	12	0
HAWKER'S (REV. ROBERT) POOR MAN'S MORNING PORTION AND EVENING PORTION. 8vo.	0	15	0
HERVEY'S THERON AND ASPASIO. 8vo.	0	10	6
———— MEDITATIONS AND CONTEMPLATIONS. 8vo.	0	5	0
HILL'S (REV. ROWLAND) VILLAGE DIALOGUES. 34th Edition. 12mo.	0	6	0
HOOKE'S ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY. 2 vols. 8vo.	0	11	
JENKS'S FAMILY DEVOTION. By SIMEON. 12mo.	0	3	

	£	s.	d.
LAWS OF CHRIST RESPECTING CIVIL OBEDIENCE, &c. 8vo.	0	16	0
LEIGHTON'S (ARCHBISHOP) WORKS. 8vo.	0	8	0
LECTURES, THEOLOGICAL, &c.	0	2	6
LOWTH'S (BISHOP) SERMONS. By HALL. 8vo.	0	12	0
MASON ON SELF-KNOWLEDGE. 32mo.	0	2	0
SPIRITUAL TREASURY FOR THE CHILDREN OF GOD. 8vo.	0	7	0
MASSILLON'S SERMONS. New Edition. 8vo.	0	9	0
MILNER'S CHURCH HISTORY. By HAWES. 8vo.	0	12	0
MORE'S (HANNAH) PRACTICAL PIETY. 32mo.	0	2	6
MORNING EXERCISES AT CRIPPLEGATE, AND GILES-IN-THE-FIELDS. New Edition. By J. NICHOLS. 6 vols. 8vo.	3	14	0
MOSHEIM'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. 2 vols. 8vo.	1	1	0
NELSON'S FASTS & FESTIVALS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. 8vo.	0	8	0
NEWTON'S (REV. JOHN) THEOLOGICAL WORKS. 8vo.	0	10	6
OLNEY HYMNS. By COWPER and NEWTON. 32mo.	0	1	6
ORTON'S (REV. JOB) PRACTICAL WORKS. 2 vols. 8vo.	1	4	0
PALEY'S WORKS. New Edition. 8vo.	0	12	0
NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS. By PAXTON. 5 vols. 8vo.	2	5	0
PASCAL'S THOUGHTS ON RELIGION. 18mo.	0	2	6
PEARSON ON THE CREED. A New Edition. By NICHOLS. 8vo.	0	10	6
PITMAN'S SERMONS FOR EVERY SUNDAY IN THE YEAR. 2 vols.	1	1	0
SECOND COURSE. 2 vols.	1	1	0
PORTEUS'S (BISHOP) LECTURES ON ST. MATTHEW. 8vo.	0	7	0
PULPIT (THE BRITISH). 6 vols. 8vo. (Scarce)	2	14	0
QUARLES' DIVINE AND MORAL EMBLEMS. Sqr. 32mo.	0	3	0
SCHOOL OF THE HEART. Sqr. 32mo.	0	2	6
QUESNEL'S REFLECTIONS ON THE GOSPELS. Essay by WITMAN, 3 vols. 12mo.	1	1	0
ROBERT'S ORIENTAL ILLUSTRATION OF THE SCRIPTURE, 8vo.	0	12	0
ROBINSON'S SCRIPTURE CHARACTERS. 8vo.	0	9	0
ROMAINE'S THEOLOGICAL WORKS. 8vo.	0	9	0
ROWE'S DEVOUT EXERCISES OF THE HEART	0	1	6
SAURIN'S SERMONS. New Edition. By BURDER. 3 vols.	1	16	0
SCOTT'S (REV. THOMAS) THEOLOGICAL WORKS. CHISWICK.	0	8	0
SIMPSON'S PLEA FOR RELIGION AND THE SACRED WRITINGS. 12mo.	0	4	6
SOUTH'S SERMONS AND POSTHUMOUS WORKS. 4 vols. 8vo.	2	0	0
SPRING'S OBLIGATIONS OF THE WORLD TO THE BIBLE. 32mo.	0	3	0
STURM'S REFLECTIONS ON THE WORKS OF GOD. By Dr. CLARKE. 2 vols.	0	12	0
THE SABBATH SCHOOL AS IT SHOULD BE. Royal 32mo.	0	2	6
TODD'S SABBATH SCHOOL TEACHER	0	3	0
WORKS ON SUNDAY TEACHING, &c. 8vo.	0	8	0
VENN'S COMPLETE DUTY OF MAN. 12mo.	0	4	0
WAKE'S (BISHOP) GENUINE APOSTOLICAL EPISTLES. 12mo.	0	5	0
WARDEN'S SYSTEM OF REVEALED RELIGION. By NICHOLS. 8vo.	0	10	6
WATTS'S PSALMS AND HYMNS. 48mo. Pocket Edition	0	1	6
(BARFIELD'S Edition.) 8vo. cloth	0	10	6
SCRIPTURE HISTORY. 12mo.	0	4	0
HOPEFUL YOUTH FALLING SHORT OF HEAVEN	0	1	0
GUIDE TO PRAYER. 32mo.	0	1	6
DEATH AND HEAVEN. 32mo.	0	1	6
WESLEY'S SERMONS, Edited by DREW. 2 vols. 8vo.	1	1	0
WHEATLY ON THE COMMON PRAYER. 8vo.	0	8	0
WILBERFORCE'S PRACTICAL VIEW OF CHRISTIANITY. 32mo.	0	2	0
WILLIAMS'S CHRISTIAN PREACHER. By JACKSON. 12mo.	0	4	6
WITSIUS ON THE COVENANT BETWEEN GOD AND MAN. 2 vols.	1	4	0

CHEMISTRY, NATURAL HISTORY, BOTANY, MEDICINE, &c.

ABERCROMBIE'S POCKET GARDEN-
ER'S CALENDAR, 18mo. 2s.
BERTHOLLET ON DYEING, by URR, 12s.
BEST'S ART OF ANGLING, by JACKSON,
32mo. 2s. 6d.
BUCHAN'S DOMESTIC MEDICINE,
8vo. 7s. 6d.
BUFFON'S NATURAL HISTORY, New
Edition, by WRIGHT, 466 Cuts, 4 vols. 1l. 4s.
CHEMICAL CATECHISM (PARKE'S), 5s.
DAVY'S AGRICULTURAL CHEMISTRY,
8vo. 9s.
GARDENS & MENAGERIE OF THE ZOO-
LOGICAL SOCIETY. 222 Cuts. 2 vols. 1l. 1s.

GRIFFIN'S SCIENTIFIC MISCELLANY
8vo. 1l. 1s.
HUBER'S OBSERVATIONS ON THE
HONEY-BEE. 12mo. 6s.
MAWE'S EVERY MAN HIS OWN GAR-
DENER, 6s.
NATURAL HISTORY OF INSECTS. Cuts.
2 vols. 10s.
RYDGE'S VETERINARY SURGEONS'
MANUAL, 4th Edition, 6s.
THOMSON'S INORGANIC CHEMISTRY,
2 vols. 8vo. 1l. 5s.
WHITE'S NATURAL HISTORY OF
SELBORNE, by Lady DOVER, 3s. 6d.

GENERAL ENGLISH LITERATURE.

- ABBOT'S HOARY HEAD AND THE VALLEY BELOW,** 2s. 6d.
ABBOT'S (JACOB AND JOHN) WORKS. 11 vols. 64mo. Cloth, Gilt, 1l.
ANECDOTE BOOK, OR FIVE HUNDRED CURIOUS NARRATIVES, &c. 12mo, 3s.
BARROW'S HISTORY OF THE MUTINY OF THE BOUNTY, 5s.
BLAIR'S LECTURES ON RHETORIC, AND BELLES LETTRES; with Introduction by DALE. 8vo.
BOOK OF TRADES, OR PARENT'S GUIDE (TEGG'S). 8vo, 8s.
BUCK'S ANECDOTES, MORAL, RELIGIOUS, AND ENTERTAINING. 12mo, 5s.
BUCKE'S HARMONIES AND SUBLIMITIES OF NATURE. 3 vols. 8vo, 1l. 11s. 6d.
BUCKE'S RUINS OF ANCIENT CITIES. 2 vols. 10s.
BULWER'S ATHENS. 2 vols. 8vo, 1l. 11s. 6d.
BURTON'S ANATOMY OF MELANCHOLY. New Edition, Plates, 8vo. 12s.
CAMPBELL'S PHILOSOPHY OF RHETORIC. 8vo, 9s.
CHANNING'S (DR. W. E.) WORKS. New Edit. 2 vols. 8vo, 12s.
CHILD'S (MRS.) FRUGAL HOUSEWIFE. New Edition, 2s.
CHILD'S (MRS.) FAMILY NURSE. Companion to the above, 3s. 6d.
CHILD'S (MRS.) MOTHER'S BOOK. 32mo, 2s.
COLERIDGE'S SIX MONTHS' RESIDENCE IN THE WEST INDIES, 5s.
COMMON SENSE FOR COMMON PEOPLE. By MARTIN DOYLE, 1s.
COWPER'S LIFE AND WORKS. BY GRIMSHAW. 8 vols. 2l.
COWPER'S POEMS. By Ditto. 18mo, cloth, 4s.
CROKER'S FAIRY LEGENDS, &c. OF THE SOUTH OF IRELAND, 5s.
CURTIS'S SIMPLICITY OF LIVING AND PRESERVATION OF HEALTH. 6s. 6d.
CYCLOPEDIA OF POPULAR SONGS. 5s.
DE FOE'S NOVELS AND MISCELLANEOUS WORKS, 20 vols., Separately at 5s.
 Robinson Crusoe complete, 2 vols.—Life and Adventures of Captain Singleton.—Fortunes and Misfortunes of the famous Moll Flanders.—Life and Adventures of Colonel Jack.—Memoirs of a Cavalier.—New Voyage Round the World.—Memoirs of Captain Carleton and Mrs. Davies.—History of the Plague; and the Consolidator.—History of the Devil.—Roxana; or, the Fortunate Mistress.—A System of Magic.—History and Reality of Apparitions.—Religious Courtship, with an Appendix.—Family Instructor, complete, 2 vols.—Complete English Tradesman, 2 vols.—Memoirs of Duncan Campbell.—Life &c.
DIARY OF AN AMERICAN PHYSICIAN, 2s.
DOUCE'S ILLUSTRATIONS OF SHAKESPEARE. 40 Engravings. 8vo, 14s.
ELEGANT EXTRACTS, PROSE. 6 vols. 18mo, 1l. 10s.
ELEGANT EXTRACTS, VERSE. 6 vols. 18mo, 1l. 10s.
ENFIELD'S HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. 8vo, 14s.
EPHRAIM HOLDING'S DOMESTIC ADDRESSES, 32mo, 2s.
FERGUSON'S LECTURES ON MECHANICS, &c., 8vo. 10s.
FLOWERS OF LOVELINESS. 12 groups. By PARIS. Folio, 1l. 11s. 6d.
 By UNWIN, 1l. 11s. 6d.
 L. E. L., 1l. 11s. 6d.
FOX'S BOOK OF MARTYRS. By MILNER. 8vo, 15s.
- FOX'S BOOK OF MARTYRS** Abridged. 16mo, 2s. 6d.
FAMILY LIBRARY, THE, IN EIGHTY VOLS. Sold Separately at 5s.
 Life of Buonaparte, 2 vols.—Life of Alexander the Great.—Lives of British Artists, 6 vols.—History of the Jews, 3 vols.—Insects, 2 vols.—Court and Camp of Buonaparte.—Life and Voyages of Columbus.—Life of Nelson, by Southey.—Lives of British Physicians.—History of British India, 4 vols.—Demonology and Witchcraft, by Scott.—Life and Travels of Bruce.—Voyages of Columbus's Companions.—Venetian History, 2 vols.—History of the Anglo-Saxons.—Lives of Scottish Worthies, 3 vols.—Tour in South Holland.—Life of Sir Isaac Newton.—Mutiny of the Bounty.—Reformation in England.—Lander's Travels in Africa, 2 vols.—Salmagundi, by Washington Irving.—Trials of Charles I. and the Regicides.—Brewster's Natural Magic.—Life of Peter the Great.—Six Months in the West Indies.—Sketch Book, by Irving, 2 vols.—Tytler's General History, 6 vols.—Croker's Fairy Legends.—Memoirs of the Plague, by De Foe and Brayley.—Life and Times of General Washington, 2 vols.—Knickerbocker's History of New York.—Wesley's Philosophy, 3 vols.—Segur's Narrative of Napoleon's Expedition to Russia, 2 vols.—Life of Ali Pasha.—Lives of Banditti and Robbers.—Sketches of Imposture, Deception, and Credulity.—History of the Bastille.—History of Gustavus Adolphus.—Chronicles of London Bridge.—Life of Duke of Marlborough.—Life of Cervantes, by Roscoe.—Life of Cicero.—Ruins of Cities, 2 vols.—Life of Richard Cœur de Lion.—Life of Mahomet.—Peril and Suffering, 2 vols.—Eustace's Classical Tour in Italy, 3 vols.—Lives of Eminent Men.—Mutiny at the Nore.
HISTORY OF THE MUTINY AT THE NORE. By W. J. NEALE, 5s.
HONE'S EVERY-DAY BOOK. Numerous Cuts. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s.
HONE'S TABLE BOOK, 8vo. 8s.
HONE'S YEAR-BOOK, 8vo. 8s.
HOLLAND'S DOMESTIC COOKERY. 12mo, 3s.
HOWARD'S BEAUTIES OF BYRON. 18mo, 2s. 6d.
INCHBALD'S BRITISH THEATRE. 20 vols. 30s.
 Any Play separately at 1s.
IRVING'S (WASHINGTON) SKETCH-BOOK. 2 vols. 10s.
KAIMES'S ELEMENTS OF CRITICISM, 8vo, 7s.
LAVATER ON PHYSIOGNOMY. 400 Cuts. 8vo, 16s.
LELAND'S VIEW OF DEISTICAL WRITERS. By EDMONDS. 8vo, 12s.
LIVE AND LET LIVE. By MISS SEDGWICK, 2s. 6d.
LOCKE'S ESSAY ON THE HUMAN UNDERSTANDING. 8vo, 9s.
LOCKE'S EDUCATION. With Notes. By ST. JOHN, 12mo, 6s.
MANUAL OF ASTROLOGY. New Edition. By RAPHAEL. 8vo, 5s.
MASON'S TREATISE ON SELF-KNOWLEDGE. 32mo, 2s.
MEMOIRS OF JOHN SHIPP. 12mo, 5s.
MILITARY REMINISCENCES. By COL. WELSH. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s.
MILTON'S POETICAL WORKS. By SIR EGERTON BRYDGES. 1 vol. 8vo, 16s.
MILTON'S POETICAL WORKS. 18mo, 3s. 6d.
 ——— PARADISE LOST. 18mo, 2s.
 ——— SELECT PROSE WORKS AND NOTES. By ST. JOHN. 2 vols. 12s.
MORE ON FEMALE EDUCATION. 18mo, 3s.
MORE'S (HANNAH) TALES FOR THE COMMON PEOPLE, 32mo, 2s. 6d.
MORE'S (HANNAH) STORIES FOR THE MIDDLE RANKS, 32mo, 2s. 6d.
MORE'S (MRS. HANNAH) MISCELLANEOUS WORKS, 2 vols. 8vo, 1l. 4s.
MORE'S DRAMAS, SEARCH, & ESSAYS, 2s. 6d.

NARRATIVES OF PERIL AND SUFFERING.

- By DAVENPORT. 2 vols. 10s.
 OWEN'S BOOK OF ROADS. 18mo. New Edition, 2s.
 PATTERSON'S BOOK OF ROADS. 8vo, 18s.
 PERKINS'S TREATISE ON HABERDASHERY. 18mo, 4s.
 PHILOSOPHY OF COMMON SENSE, 32mo. 2s.
 POST CAPTAIN, OR THE WOODEN WALLS WELL MANNED. Royal 32mo, 2s. 6d.
 REID'S ESSAYS ON THE INTELLECTUAL POWERS OF THE HUMAN MIND, with Examination Questions, &c. 8vo, 12s.
 REID'S ESSAY ON THE ACTIVE POWERS OF MAN, AND INQUIRY INTO THE HUMAN MIND; Essay on Quantity, &c. 8vo, 12s.
 RICHMOND'S ANNALS OF THE POOR. 32mo, 2s.
 SCENES IN SCOTLAND. By LEIGHTON. 12mo, 5s.
 SCENES FROM THE LIFE OF EDWARD LASCELLES, GENT., with Illustrations by G. CRUIKSHANK, 1 vol. 12mo, 12s.
 SCOTT'S LETTERS ON DEMONOLOGY AND WITCHCRAFT. 12mo, 5s.
 SCOTT'S MINSTRELSY OF THE SCOTTISH BORDER. 8vo, 7s. 6d.
 SHAKSPEARE'S DRAMATIC WORKS. Diamond Edition, 7s.
 SHAKSPEARE'S DRAMATIC AND POETIC WORKS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
 SIGOURNEY'S LETTERS TO MOTHERS, 2s.
 SIMPSON AND WISE'S READIEST READY RECKONER ever invented, 12mo, bound, 5s.

SKETCHES OF IMPOSTURE, DECEPTION, AND CREDULITY, 5s.

- STEWART'S (DUGALD) PHILOSOPHY OF THE HUMAN MIND. New Edition, with the Latin Quotations, translated. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
 THREE EXPERIMENTS OF LIVING. 32mo, 2s.
 TODD'S STUDENT'S MANUAL. 32mo, 3s.
 TODD'S LECTURES TO CHILDREN. 32mo, 2s.
 ——— TRUTH MADE SIMPLE. 32mo, 2s.
 ——— SIMPLE SKETCHES. 32mo, 2s.
 TREASURY OF WIT AND ANECDOTE. Royal 32mo, 2s. 6d.
 TRIALS OF CHARLES THE FIRST AND THE REGICIDES. 12mo, 5s.
 TWO YEARS BEFORE THE MAST. 24mo, 2s.
 VOCAL COMPANION, OR SINGER'S OWN BOOK, 12mo, 3s. 6d.
 WARTON'S HISTORY OF ENGLISH POETRY. New Edition. 3 vols. 8vo, 11. 16s.
 WATTS ON THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE MIND. 18mo, 2s.
 WESLEYANA, A SELECTION FROM WESLEY'S WRITINGS. 18mo, 3s.
 WESLEYAN METHODIST CONFERENCE. By RYERSON. 8vo, 2s.
 WESLEY'S NATURAL PHILOSOPHY. By ROBERT MUDIE. 3 vols. 15s.
 WESLEY FAMILY. By DR. A. CLARKE, 2 vols. 12s.
 WONDERS OF HUMAN NATURE. 12mo, 5s.
 YOUNG ENTHUSIAST IN HUMBLE LIFE. 18mo, 2s. 6d.
 YOUNG'S NIGHT THOUGHTS ON LIFE, DEATH, AND IMMORTALITY. 18mo, 2s.

SCHOOL BOOKS.

- ADAM'S ROMAN ANTIQUITIES. New Edition, by BOYD, with Questions, 12mo. 7s.
 ÆSCHYLUS, a New Translation. 18mo. 5s.
 ÆSOP'S FABLES. (Chiswick Press.) 3s. 6d.
 AINSWORTH'S LATIN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY, by DYMCK, 18mo. 7s.
 ALEXANDER THE GREAT, LIFE OF, by Rev. J. WILLIAMS, 5s.
 ALDERSON'S ORTHOGRAPHICAL EXERCISES, 1s.
 ANTHON'S HOMER, 12mo.
 ANTHON'S VIRGIL, by TROLLOPE. 12mo, 7s. 6d.
 ANTHON'S HORACE, with English Notes. A New Edition, by BOYD, 7s. 6d.
 ANTHON'S SALLUST, with English Notes. A New Edition, by BOYD, 12mo, 5s.
 ANTHON'S CICERO'S ORATIONS, with English Notes. A New Edition, by BOYD, 12mo, 6s.
 ANTHON'S GREEK READER, with English Notes. A New Edition, by BOYD, 12mo, 7s. 6d.
 ANTHON'S CÆSAR'S COMMENTARIES, with Maps and Plates, 12mo, 6s.
 ANTHON'S GREEK GRAMMAR. New Edition, by DR. MAJOR, King's College. 12mo, 4s.
 ANTHON'S GREEK PROSODY. New Edition, by DR. MAJOR, King's College, 12mo, 2s. 6d.
 ANTHON'S LATIN GRAMMAR. New Edition. by Rev. W. HAYES, King's College, 12mo, 4s.
 BALDWIN'S ROME. 12mo. 3s. 6d.
 BALDWIN'S GREECE. 12mo. 3s. 6d.
 BALDWIN'S PANTHEON OF THE HEATHEN DEITIES. 12mo, 4s. 6d.
 BALDWIN'S FABLES. Cuts. 12mo. 4s.
 BARROW'S PETER THE GREAT, 5s.
 BONNYCASTLE'S SCHOOL BOOKS, edited by Rev. E. C. TYSON, viz.—
 Arithmetic, 3s. 6d. Key to Algebra, 4s. 6d.
 Key to Ditto, 4s. 6d. Introduction to Mensuration, 5s.
 Introduct. to Algebra, 4s. Key to Mensuration, 5s.
 BOYER'S FRENCH DICTIONARY, 8vo. 12s.

BURGESS'S (BISHOP) HEBREW ELEMENTS. 12mo, 6s.

- BURGESS'S (BISHOP) RUDIMENTS OF HEBREW GRAMMAR. 7s.
 CARR'S MANUAL OF ROMAN ANTIQUITIES. 12mo, 6s. 6d.
 CICERO'S EPISTOLÆ AD ATTICUM. 2 vols. 12mo, 12s.
 CRABB'S DICTIONARY OF GENERAL KNOWLEDGE. Fourth Edition. 7s.
 DAVENPORT'S WALKER'S DICTIONARY IN MINIATURE. 18mo, 5s.
 DUNCAN'S (Rev. Dr.) HEBREW LEXICON AND GRAMMAR. 18mo, 7s.
 ENFIELD'S SPEAKER. A New Edition. 3s. 6d.
 ENFIELD'S PROGRESSIVE SPELLING-BOOK. New Edition. 1s. 3d.
 ETON GREEK GRAMMAR, by HOMER, 12mo, 4s.
 FINLAY'S GENERAL SCHOOL ATLAS. Royal 8vo. 30 Maps. Coloured 12s.
 ——— OUTLINE MAPS. Royal 8vo. 5s.
 FRENCH CLASSICS FOR SCHOOLS, edited by VENTOUILLAC, 18mo, viz.—
 Nouveaux Morceaux Choix des Contes Merveilleux de Buffon. raux de Marmontel. 2s. 6d. 2s. 6d.
 LaChaumière Indienne. Histoire de Pierre le Grand. VOLTAIRE. 5s.
 ST. PIERRE. 2s. 6d. Pensées de Pascal. 2s. 6d.
 ELLIS'S LATIN EXERCISES. New Edition. By WRIGHT. 3s. 6d.
 GUY'S SCHOOL BOOKS—
 British Primer, 12mo. with Chart, 12mo. half-bound, 6d. roan, 4s. 6d.
 Spelling Book, 12mo. School Arithmetic, 12mo. sheep, 1s. 6d. sheep, 2s.
 Expositor, 12mo, shp. Key to ditto, 12mo. roan, 4s. 6d.
 British Reader, 12mo, roan, 3s. 6d. Pocket Cyclopædia, 12mo. cloth, 10s. 6d.
 School Question Book,

GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY. By a Lady.
New Edition. By WRIGHT. 12mo, 4s. 6d.
GOLDSMITH'S GRAMMAR OF GEOGRAPHY.
New Edition. By WRIGHT. 18mo, 3s. 6d.
HUTTON'S MATHEMATICS. A New Edition.
By RUTHERFORD. 8vo, 16s.
HUTTON'S MATHEMATICAL RECREA-
TIONS. By RIDDLE. 8vo, 16s.
JOHNSON'S ENGLISH DICTIONARY. (Pocket
Size.) 2s.
JONES'S SHERIDAN'S PRONOUNCING DIC-
TIONARY, square, 3s. 6d.
JOYCE'S COMMERCIAL ARITHMETIC, by
WRIGHT, 12mo, 3s.
JOYCE'S INTRODUCTION TO THE ARTS
AND SCIENCES. 12mo, 3s. 6d. [3s. 6d.
JOYCE'S SCIENTIFIC DIALOGUES. 12mo,
KEITH ON THE USE OF THE GLOBES.
New Edition, by WRIGHT, 12mo, 6s. 6d.
LEMPRIERE'S CLASSICAL DICTIONARY.
By PARK. 18mo, 7s.
LENNIE'S ENGLISH GRAMMAR. 18mo, 1s. 6d.
MADAN'S JUVENAL. 2 vols. 8vo, 14s.
MANGNALL'S HISTORICAL AND MISCEL-
LANEOUS QUESTIONS. 12mo, 4s. 6d.
MAVOR'S SPELLING-BOOK. 12mo. 1s.
MEADOWS'S ITALIAN AND ENGLISH DIC-
TIONARY. 18mo, 7s.
MEADOWS'S FRENCH AND ENGLISH PRO-
NOUNCING DICTIONARY. 18mo. 7s.
MEADOWS'S SPANISH AND ENGLISH DIC-
TIONARY. 18mo, 7s.
MORRISON'S BOOK-KEEPING. 8vo. 8s.
MURRAY'S (LINDLEY) SCHOOL-BOOKS,
edited by TYSON, viz.—
English Gram. 4s. English Reader. 12mo,
—— (Abridged). 4s.
18mo, 1s. Introduction to the En-
—— Exercises. glish Reader. 12mo,
12mo, 2s. 6d. 2s.
Key to the Exercises. Grammar & Exercises.
12mo, 2s. 6d. By GARTLEY. 18mo, 2s.

NEWTON'S PRINCIPIA MATHEMATICA. 2
vols. Royal 8vo, 1l. 5s.
NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRÆCE. 32mo, 5s.
PARLEY'S UNIVERSAL HISTORY. 4s. 6d.
PARLEY'S GRAMMAR OF GEOGRAPHY,
4s. 6d.
PARLEY'S TALES ABOUT GREECE. 4s. 6d.
PARLEY'S TALES ABOUT ROME. 4s. 6d.
PARLEY'S MYTHOLOGY OF GREECE. 4s. 6d.
PERRIN'S ELEMENTS OF FRENCH CON-
VERSATION. By WRIGHT. 12mo, 1s. 6d.
PERRIN'S FRENCH FABLES. 12mo, 2s. 6d.
PERRIN'S FRENCH SPELLING-BOOK. By
WRIGHT. 12mo, 2s.
PINDARI CARMINA. HEYNE. 32mo. 4s.
PINNOCK'S ENGLAND. New Edit. 12mo, 5s. 6d.
POTTER'S ANTIQUITIES OF GREECE. By
BOYD. 12mo. 9s.
QUESTIONS ON ADAM'S ROMAN ANTIQUI-
TIES. By BOYD. 1s. 8d.
RAMSHORN'S DICTIONARY OF LATIN
SYNONYMES. 8vo. 7s.
SEPTUAGINT (The GREEK). 2 vols. 32mo, 12s.
SIMSON'S EUCLID, by RUTHERFORD. 18mo, 5s.
TEGG'S FIRST BOOK FOR CHILDREN, 6d.
TOM TELESCOPE'S NEWTONIAN PHILOSO-
PHY. Cuts. 4s. 6d.
TOOKE'S (HORNE) DIVERSIONS OF PUR-
LEY. New Edition, by TAYLOR. 8vo. 14s.
TROLLOPE'S (Rev. W., M.A.) GREEK TES-
TAMENT, 8vo. 21s.
VALPY'S LATIN DELECTUS, by WRIGHT. 2s. 6d.
WALKINGAME'S TUTOR, 12mo. 2s.
WANOSTROCHT'S RECUEIL CHOISI, New
Edit. by WRIGHT, 12mo. 3s.
WATTS'S VIEW OF SCRIPTURE HISTORY,
12mo, 4s. 6d.
WRIGHT'S COMMENTARY ON NEWTON'S
PRINCIPIA. 2 vols. 1l. 8s.
WRIGHT'S GREEK AND ENGLISH LEXICON.
18mo, 7s.

DICTIONARIES, LEXICONS, &c.

FINDLAY'S BROOKES'S GENERAL GA-
ZETTEER. 8vo. 12s.
FINDLAY'S BROOKES'S GENERAL GA-
ZETTEER IN MINIATURE. 7s.
BROWN'S (REV. JOHN) DICTIONARY
OF THE HOLY BIBLE, 8vo. 9s.
BUCK'S THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY,
New Edition, by HENDERSON, 8vo. 14s.
CALMET'S DICTIONARY OF THE HOLY
BIBLE, by TAYLOR, Imperial 8vo. 1l.
CARPENTER'S DICTIONARY OF SY-
NONYMES, 3rd Edition, 18mo, 2s. 6d.
CRABB'S DICTIONARY OF GENERAL
KNOWLEDGE, 4th Edition, 12mo, 7s.
CRUDEN'S CONCORDANCE OF THE OLD
AND NEW TESTAMENT, Imperial 8vo. 18s.
CUNNINGHAM'S (A.) PILKINGTON'S
DICTIONARY OF PAINTERS, 8vo, 21s.
DAVENPORT'S WALKER'S PRONOUN-
CING DICTIONARY, 18mo. 5s.
DOLBY'S SHAKSPEARIAN DICTIO-
NARY, an Index to Shakspeare, 12mo, 7s. 6d.
DUNCAN'S (REV. DR.) HEBREW LEXI-
CON AND GRAMMAR, 18mo. 7s.
DYMCK'S AINSWORTH'S LATIN
AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY, 18mo. 7s.
GORTON'S TOPOGRAPHICAL DIC-
TIONARY OF GREAT BRITAIN, & Atlas, 4 v. 72s.
GURNEY'S DIAMOND DICTIONARY
OF THE BIBLE, 24mo. 3s. 6d.

GUTHRIE'S GEOGRAPHY IN MINIA-
TURE, by DAVENPORT, 18mo, 7s.
JOHNSON'S DIAMOND DICTIONARY
OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, 32mo. 2s.
JOHNSON'S DICTIONARY OF THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE, 2 vols. 4to. 2l. 2s.
JONES'S (STEPHEN) BIOGRAPHICAL
DICTIONARY, 18mo. 6s.
JONES'S BIBLICAL CYCLOPÆDIA, 16s.
LEMPRIERE'S CLASSICAL DICTIO-
NARY, by PARKE, 18mo, 7s.
MEADOWS'S ITALIAN AND ENGLISH
DICTIONARY, 18mo. 7s.
MEADOWS'S FRENCH AND ENGLISH
PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY, 18mo. 7s.
MEADOWS'S SPANISH AND ENGLISH
DICTIONARY, 18mo. 7s.
MITCHELL'S PORTABLE CYCLOPÆ-
DIA, 50 Plates, 8vo. 1l. 1s.
NUTTALL'S CLASSICAL AND ARCHÆ-
OLOGICAL DICTIONARY, 8vo. 16s.
ROBINSON'S GREEK AND ENGLISH
LEXICON OF THE TESTAMENT, 8vo. 15s.
TEGG'S DICTIONARY OF CHRONO-
LOGY. 12mo. 6s.
WALKER'S CRITICAL PRONOUNCING
DICTIONARY, 8vo. 7s.
WALKER'S PRONOUNCING DICTIO-
NARY, and the Key to Proper Names, 8vo. 9s.

As miracles were the great instrument to convert the Jews and Gentiles in the apostolical age; so the absence of them at present must needs be a disadvantage, as far as the propagation of Christianity is concerned. The Jews will say, If the miracles recorded in your sacred books were really wrought, our ancestors were inexcusable in rejecting Christianity; but these are transactions of remote antiquity, and we cannot be charged at present with resisting such evidence. If it should please God to enable you to show us the like wonders, you should find us more compliant. In the mean time we choose to adhere to a religion, which you, as well as we, hold to have been of divine original. These arguments are not conclusive; but, as they are not destitute of a plausible appearance, prejudiced persons will not easily give them up.

Thus the conversion of the Jews seems to be removed to a distant day: but the Scriptures, as we observed, give us reasons to expect it; and this expectation is much confirmed by the wonderful preservation of that people. If, therefore, there be a time in the decrees of Providence, when many who sit in darkness shall be enlightened; when the everlasting gospel shall be more generally known and received, and the Jews shall be called to partake of this blessing; it is to be supposed that the present obstructions to it will be removed, and in particular those which arise from Popery. Popery is the most degenerate form of Christianity that can be conceived, and lays a heavier yoke upon the necks of Christians, than the Scribes and the Pharisees ever imposed upon the Jews. It is a religion which can never make its way but by cruelty and tyranny, by gibbets and inquisitions, nor be supported but by self interest and ignorance; and yet, as it is received by many great and polite, learned and flourishing nations, it seems at present secure from ruin. But the smaller hope, and the remoter prospect there is of the extinction of this tyranny, the more remarkable, and the more providential, will the downfall of it appear to all the world, if ever it happens; and it will strike Jews and Mohammedans and

contra me argumentari debet: non ex doctrinis, de quibus inter Christianos disputatur, et quarum fidem Scriptura nusquam sub amittendæ salutis pœna exigit. Respons. p. 296.

Gentiles with amazement, and prepare the way for their conversion.

The next step towards the increase of Christ's kingdom must be a farther improvement of Christianity, and of those who receive and profess it. The Church of Rome is not the only Church that wants amendment. Other Christian societies, which have separated themselves from her and from her grosser defects, are departed more or less from the original simplicity of the gospel; and have mixed some doctrines of men with the word of God, and so stand in need of some improvement. It is therefore to be hoped that a time will come when religion will have a fairer and a more alluring aspect; when Christians will be united, not in opinion as to all theological points—for that is impossible whilst men are men—but that they will be united in benevolence and charity, in intercommunion, and in one *common and simple profession of faith*; that their manners will be suitable to their profession; and that they will be more peaceable, more virtuous, and more pious; and then the external impediments to the conversion of unbelievers will in no small measure be removed. These are amendments which seem, besides human efforts, to require such a concurrence of favourable circumstances, as scarcely ever meet and are united; together with supernatural aids, and an effusion of divine gifts and graces. Therefore, it may be said, such a change, such a regeneration of mankind is not to be expected. And yet strange things have been accomplished. Who that had seen the dreadful destruction of Jerusalem could have thought that the Jewish nation, so enfeebled, so dispersed, so abhorred, and so oppressed in all places, would have subsisted for seventeen hundred ages? Who that had beheld the beginnings of Christianity, and the difficulties which it had to encounter, would have imagined that it would spread through the known world? Who that had seen a poor monk set his face against popes and emperors, would have believed that the preaching of Luther should have brought about a Reformation, and the establishment of the Protestant religion?

Nothing is too hard for Omnipotence. Great and glorious changes, even a *New Earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness*, may

be produced by instruments and by methods of which we are now ignorant, and which it is vain to seek out by conjectures. These *secret things* belong to the Lord our God, and to him we must leave them. Our duty is to do all that lies in our power towards increasing his dominion, by studying to understand his gospel; by a sober care and concern to live suitably to its holy precepts, and by not only wishing and praying, but endeavouring, that *his kingdom may come, and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven.*

END OF VOL. I.

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

LONDON :

BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

Obermeyer

Kundenkarte Nr. RA 80146

Verkaufsstelle: 80146

8303 Rottenburg/L

Jortin, John

Remarks on ecclesiastical history Edited, with copious notes, and an
account of the life ... of the author, by William Trollope

Bd.: 1

London 1846

H.eccl. 541 s-1

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10025418-3